THE Lutheran Quarterly

me IV MAY, 1952 Number 2

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume IV MAY, 1952 Number 2

CONTENTS

THE COMMON HYMNAL — *E. E. Ryden* 123
ON THE QUESTION OF DE-MYTHOLOGIZING CHRISTIANITY — *Anders Nygren* 140
LUTHER'S VIEW CONCERNING THE IMPERIAL FOREIGN POLICY — *George W. Forell* 153
WILHELM LOEHE — *Gerhard Ottersberg* 170
THAT THE MAN OF GOD MAY BE ADEQUATE — *Harry F. Baughman* 191
NOTES AND STUDIES
Muhlenberg as Pastor — *Sim Southard* 206
The Benediction — *George Drach* 209
BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES
Kraeling, *John the Baptist* (R. T. Stamm) — 215
Rypins, *The Book of Thirty Centuries* (G. E. Mendenhall) — 217
Bewer, *The Book of Jeremiah*, Vol. I (J. M. Myers) — 218
Runes, *The Hebrew Impact on Western Civilization* (C. M. Cooper) — 218
Brod, *The Master* (U. S. Leopold) — 218
Kuiper, *The Church in History* (P. H. Roth) — 220
Tomkins, *The Church in the Purpose of God* (C. Bergendoff) — 220
Nash, ed., *Protestant Thought in the Twentieth Century* (W. D. Allbeck) — 220
Mead, *Handbook of Denominations in the United States* — 221
Barclay, *Early American Methodism* (T. G. Tappert) — 222
Dallmann, *Martin Luther: His Life and His Labor* — 222
Stephan, *Luther in den Wandlungen seiner Kirche* — 222
Schmid, *Apokalyptisches Wetterleuchten* (E. T. Bachmann) — 223
Hermelink, *Kirche im Kampf* (E. T. Bachmann) — 223
Berdyaev, *Dream and Reality* (J. Aberly) — 224
Wenger, *Separated Unto God* — 225
Ferré, *The Christian Understanding of God* (T. A. Kantonen) — 225
Vogel, *Christologie* (M. J. Heinecken) — 227
Warfield, *The Person and Work of Christ* (E. W. Matzner) — 228
Beltz, *Truth of Life—Key to Understanding* (H. Keiter) — 228
Green, *The Practice of Evangelism* (R. W. Loew) — 229
Gilkey, *Here Is Help for You* (G. H. Muedeking) — 229
Tauson-Hassler, *Kämpende Kyrka* (A. D. Mattson) — 230
Runestam, *Tro och Tvivel* (A. D. Mattson) — 230
Rundblom, *En bok om flygplanet Ansger* (E. H. Wahlstrom) — 231
Blackwood, *Preaching from Prophetic Books* (H. F. Baughman) — 231
Sherrill, *The Struggle of the Soul* (C. V. Leitzel) — 232
Marquette, *Introduction to Comparative Mysticism* (H. W. Johnson) — 232
Poteat, *God Makes the Difference* (T. A. Kantonen) — 234
Twenty Confirmation Sermons (A. J. Traver) — 235
Maier, *One Thousand Radio Voices for Christ* — 235
Maurer, *The Ten Commandments Will Not Budge* (G. M. Ruoss) — 235
Lee, *So You Want to Speak* (H. B. Luffberry) — 235
Rosenberg, *Ersta en bildrapsodi* (B. Lotz) — 236
Borgenstierne, *Vår Tro och Vårt Vetande* (H. W. Johnson) — 236
Pleijel, *Från Hustavlans Tid* (C. Bergendoff) — 237
Fritschel, *Biography of Drs. Sigmund and Gottfried Fritschel* (A. A. Jagnow) 238
Thomas, *Medieval Skepticism and Chaucer* — 239
Nystrom, *When We Pray* (H. D. Hoover) — 239
CONTRIBUTORS — 240

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Office of Publication, Seminary Hill, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly*, founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review*, founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly*, Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, Books for review to the Book Review Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription $2.75 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor
CONRAD BERGENDOFF
Augustana College, Rock Island, Illinois

Managing Editor
THEODORE S. LIEFELD
Capital University Seminary, Columbus, Ohio

Book Editor
THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Road, Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Circulation Manager
ANDREW S. BURGESS
Luther Seminary, Como Ave. and Luther Place, St. Paul, Minnesota

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
GETTYSBURG, PA.

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
COLUMBUS, OHIO

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
DUBUQUE, IOWA

LUTHER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ST. PAUL, MINN.

AUGSBURG, SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

CENTRAL SEMINARY
FREMONT, NEB.

CHICAGO LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MAYWOOD, ILL.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SEMINARY OF CANADA
WATERLOO, ONT.

GRANDVIEW SEMINARY
DES MOINES, IOWA

HAMMA DIVINITY SCHOOL
SPRINGFIELD, OHIO

LUTHERAN SEMINARY
SASKATOON, SASK.

NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

SOUTHERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
COLUMBIA, S. C.

SUOMI SEMINARY
HANCOCK, MICH.

TRINITY SEMINARY
BLAIR, NEB.

AIMS AND POLICY

I. *Aims:* The aims of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.

II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

The Common Hymnal

E. E. Ryden

III. THE HYMNS

IN A previous issue of The Lutheran Quarterly* we discussed 1) the historical background of the Common Lutheran Hymnal and 2) the guiding principles observed by the Commission in the selection of hymns. In this and in a concluding installment we will seek to acquaint the reader more specifically with the type of hymns that will be found in the eagerly awaited book of worship when it finally appears—possibly in the Advent season of 1954 or at Eastertide in 1955.

We have already stated that a Christian hymnbook must of necessity be ecumenical in character, reflecting continuity with the true Church of Christ and the saints of God throughout the centuries. Indeed, no more convincing witness to the reality of the Una Sancta can be found than that which is offered by the standard hymnals of Christendom. Catholicity belongs to the very essence of Christian hymnody. Though divided by language, customs, doctrines, traditions, and many other barriers, true Christians of all climes and communions are at least one in worshiping and adoring the same God and Lord; and what a sublime chorus of praise is heard when their anthems are collected within the covers of one of our church hymnals!

In seeking for the purest sources of Christian hymnody, it is only natural that the hymnbook compiler should look to those pristine springs of early Christian worship from which flowed the first offerings of praise to the Triune God. These sources are the Greek and Latin liturgies and lyrics of the post-apostolic era, as well as those of later periods of the Church when artists and sculptors vied

*August, 1950.

with poets and musicians in beautifying the Christian sanctuary and making its worship more glorious.

For the English-speaking world, a large part of this heritage of worship and song has been preserved as a result of the epochal work of a number of singularly gifted poets and translators, among whom must be mentioned John Mason Neale, Edward Caswall and Robert Bridges. The so-called Oxford Movement during the middle of the last century gave the initial impetus to this work. While evangelical Christians, of course, must of necessity lament the final outcome of a movement which carried a large number of brilliant clergymen and scholars into the fold of Rome, including John Newman, there are other aspects of the Oxford Movement for which they will be forever grateful. For one thing, because of the stimulus it gave to research into classical liturgy and hymnody, it may be said to have completely revolutionized Christian worship in England. It created a deeper reverence for the sanctuary, it enriched and embellished every part of its service, it raised the standards of church music, and, above all, it finally broke the iron rule of psalmody which a Calvinistic Puritanism had imposed on the worship life of the English people. The publication in 1861 of the great hymnal, *Hymns Ancient and Modern,* was an epoch-making event for the whole Church and particularly for the English-speaking world. For the first time in its history, England had an ecumenical hymnbook to take the place of the old Metrical Psalter. More than that, it gave to the Christian world, this time in the most widely used of modern languages, some of the choicest gems from the rich treasury of Greek and Latin hymnody. We have mentioned this hymn-book, as well as the Oxford Movement, in order that the reader may know the source of the very large number of classical Christian lyrics that will adorn the pages of our new Common Hymnal.

GREEK HYMNS

Certain of the Greek hymns are already to be found in a number of our present Lutheran collections, but for the sake of the

record we will attempt to enumerate all that have been included in the new hymnbook. First and foremost, of course, is what is regarded by most scholars as the oldest metrical hymn extant, namely "Shepherd of tender youth." Probably written about the year A.D. 200, it was appended by Clement of Alexandria to a prose volume bearing the title, *The Tutor*. The purpose of this book was to instruct newly converted heathen in matters of Christian conduct. The commonly used translation gives the impression that it was written for the children (tender youth) of the Church, but a closer examination of Clement's original reveals the fact that he had in mind mature converts, "babes in Christ," who needed guidance in overcoming their former pagan ways.

Also among the very earliest of Greek lyrics is the so-called candlelighting hymn, "Hail, gladdening light, of His pure glory poured." Because of metrical difficulties, the Commission has decided to use Robert Bridges' more regular rendition:

O gladsome light, O grace
Of God the Father's face,
  The eternal splendor wearing;
Celestial, holy, blest,
Our Saviour, Jesus Christ,
  Joyful in Thine appearing.

This hymn is beautifully reminiscent of the historical fact, as Pliny the Younger in A.D. 112 records in a letter to Emperor Trajan, that the Christians in his province of Bithynia met at dawn and sunset to sing "an antiphonal chant to Christ as to a god." It is quite possible that this was such a chant. Quoted by Basil, who died in A.D. 379, it may be even older than Clement's famous hymn.

To this early period of Greek hymnody belongs also the simple yet gripping hymn of Synesius, Bishop of Ptolemais, contemporary and friend of St. Augustine. Quite evidently written in the early part of the fifth century, when the Goths were knocking at the gates of Rome and the foundations of the ancient Greco-Roman

civilization were crumbling, the hymn is the touching prayer of an old and tired man who longs for peace:

Lord Jesus, think on me
And purge away my sin;
From earthborn passions set me free,
And make me pure within.

Lord Jesus, think on me,
With care and woe opprest;
Let me thy loving servant be,
And taste thy promised rest.

From the ancient liturgy of St. James, at one time believed to have been the work of James the Less, brother of our Lord, comes the impressive Cherubic Hymn, "Let all mortal flesh keep silence." It is very probably from the fourth and fifth century, and was sung in the midst of the celebration of the Eucharist as the sacred elements were brought into the sanctuary.

Some of our finest Greek hymns have come out of the monastic life of the Eastern Church. This is particularly true of the Monastery of Mar Saba, located in a desert spot overlooking the Dead Sea, and of the Monastery of the Studium in Constantinople. Greatest among the hymn-writers of Mar Saba was John of Damascus, who forsook a life of wealth and position to spend his remaining years within the desolate walls of this ancient cloister. From John's pen our collection will be enriched by the two famous Easter hymns, "The day of resurrection" and "Come, ye faithful, raise the strain." The first of these belongs to the "Golden Canon" series of Easter odes by John and is traditionally sung in the Greek churches at midnight on Easter morn, just as the people, upon a given signal, light their candles, transforming the darkness into a sudden blaze of light.

Other hymns from the Mar Saba writers include Andrew of Crete's "Christian, dost thou see them" and Stephen the Sabaite's "Art thou weary, art thou languid?" All of the Mar Saba hymns hark back to the seventh and eighth centuries.

To the Studium writers we are indebted for five hymns included in our collection. Two are attributed to Anatolius, concerning whom practically nothing is known except that he lived in the seventh or eighth century. They are "Fierce was the wild billow" and the peaceful evening hymn:

The day is past and over;
All thanks, O Lord, to thee!
I pray thee that offenceless
The hours of dark may be.
O Jesus, keep me in thy sight,
And guard me through the coming night.

St. Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople, who died in A.D. 780 at the age of 100 years, is believed to have written the Christmas Eve hymn, "A great and mighty wonder"; Joseph the Hymnographer (740-883) is credited with the authorship of "Stars of the morning, so gloriously bright," and Theoctistus, who was one of the last of the Studium hymnists, wrote "Jesus, name all names above," which has been called "one of the sweetest hymns of adoration in existence." Nearly all of the translations in the collection from Greek sources are from the pen of John Mason Neale.

LATIN HYMNS

It is eminently fitting that the Father of Latin hymnody, St. Ambrose, who introduced hymns in the worship of the Western Church, should be represented by at least two hymns in the Common Hymnal. They are "O splendor of God's glory bright" and "O Strength and Stay, upholding all creation." Two other very fine hymns, "That Easter day with joy was bright" and "O Trinity, of blessed light," are also sometimes ascribed to the famous bishop of Milan, but there is some doubt concerning their authorship.

To the Spanish bard, Aurelius Clemens Prudentius, who has been called the "Horace of the Christians," we are indebted for three of the finest hymns in our collection. The more familiar of these are "Of the Father's love begotten" (*Corde natus ex Pa-*

rentis) and "Earth has many a noble city," both of which are centos from the *Cathemerinon* of Prudentius. Not so well known in English hymnals is "Despair not, O heart, in thy sorrow," which has come to us through German and Scandinavian translations of the original. It is a cento from Prudentius' famous funeral hymn, *Deus ignee fons animarum,* sometimes referred to as the "Song of the Catacombs."

Gregory the Great is believed by some authorities to be the author of "O Christ, our King, Creator, Lord," which also dates from this early period of the Western Church.

From Venantius Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers in the sixth century, we have received two of the most beautiful of all hymns on the Cross, "Sing, my tongue, the glorious battle" and "The royal banners forward go."

Faithful cross! above all other,
  One and only noble tree!
None in foliage, none in blossom,
  None in fruit thy peer may be:
Sweetest wood, and sweetest iron!
  Sweetest weight is hung on thee!

Bend thy boughs, O tree of glory!
  Thy relaxing sinews bend;
For a while the ancient rigor
  That thy birth bestowed, suspend;
And the king of heavenly beauty
  On thy bosom gently tend!

There are also two Easter hymns in the collection from the pen of Fortunatus: "Welcome, happy morning, age to age shall say" and "Praise the Saviour." The latter is a paraphrased cento from *Pange linqua glorioso* and is sung to a stirring chorale of early origin.

To this early period of Latin hymnody also belong certain anonymous hymns, such as "Hark, a thrilling voice is sounding," "Draw nigh, and take the body of the Lord," "Blessed city, heav-

enly Salem," "Christ is made the sure foundation," "O come, O come, Emmanuel," and "O Christ, our hope, our heart's desire."

Another touch of antiquity is added to the collection by the inclusion of "A hymn of glory let us sing" which comes from the eighth century and is believed to be the work of the Venerable Bede. Nor must we forget the famous Palm Sunday lyric, "All glory, laud and honor," which was written by Bishop Theodulph of Orleans about A.D. 820.

Considerable study was given by the Commission to various translations of *Veni Sancte Spiritus* and *Veni Creator Spiritus.* The versions that will probably appear in the collection are "Come, Holy Ghost, in love," "Come, Holy Ghost, our souls inspire," "Come, Holy Spirit, God and Lord," and "Creator Spirit, by whose aid." The last-named translation, incidentally, is by John Dryden. We will not here enter into the many speculations extant regarding the Latin authorship of these noble hymns in praise of the Holy Spirit.

From the poems of St. Bernard of Clairvaux our collection has derived four or possibly five hymns that may well be regarded as indispensable in any standard church hymnal. It is to Paul Gerhardt, of course, that all of Christendom is indebted for the moving German version of Clairvaux's *Salve, caput cruentatum,* one of the seven prayers addressed to various members of the body of Christ as He suffers on the Cross. Philip Schaff, in *Christ in Song,* has well said: "This classical hymn has shown an imperishable vitality in passing from the Latin into the German, and from the German into the English, and proclaiming in three tongues, and in the name of three Confessions—the Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed—with equal effect, the dying love of our Saviour and our boundless indebtedness to Him."

Three other hymns generally ascribed to Bernard are the exquisite gems of medieval piety, "Jesus, the very thought of thee," "Jesus, King most wonderful," and "Jesus, thou joy of loving hearts." They are derived from *Jubilus rhythmicus de Nomine Jesus,* a poem of 192 lines which most scholars believe was written in A.D. 1150 after the miserable failure of the Second Crusade,

to which Clairvaux had aroused Europe by his preaching. Weary of the world and languishing in retirement, the great mystic found solace in Him who alone can bring balm to wounded spirits. Certainly no one has indited any lines more deeply expressive of the soul's fervent love for the Saviour than has Clairvaux, and yet there is nothing of that daring intimacy or sickly sentimentality in these hymns that is so offensive in many of our modern American hymns. It was the Englishman, Edward Caswall, who gave us the first two translations mentioned above, but it remained for an American, Ray Palmer, author of "My faith looks up to thee," to summarize the thoughts of both centos in his beautiful "Jesus, the very thought of thee." Yet another hymn, "Wide open are thy hands," is sometimes ascribed to Bernard, but we are not too certain about its origin.

And now we come to another famous series of hymns, this time four in number, written by another medieval mystic, Bernard of Cluny. They constitute the famous quartet, "The world is very evil," "Brief life is here our portion," "Jerusalem, the golden," and "For thee, O dear, dear country," all of which are drawn from his bitter satire on the evils of his day, *De Contemptu Mundi.* Although it is the temper of our time to stress the redemption of our own world rather than to emphasize longings for the world that is to be, it has seemed good to the Joint Commission to include all four of these classics in our collection, for certainly our tragic age needs something of the far-sweeping horizons of our Christian hope.

From the lauds for the Feast of Corpus Christi written by Thomas Aquinas, two hymns have been adopted: "Very bread, good Shepherd, tend us" and "O Saving Victim, opening wide." In neither of these hymns will be found any of the objectionable Romish interpretations of the Lord's Supper which occur in other of the Aquinas lyrics. Also from Aquinas is the communion hymn, "Thee we adore, O hidden Saviour," from *Adoro Te devote, latens Deitas.*

Other famous Latin hymns from the Middle Ages included in the collection are: "O what their joy and their glory must be"

by Peter Abelard, c. A.D. 1129; "All creatures of our God and King," believed to be the work of St. Francis of Assisi; "Day of wrath! O day of mourning," from a ms. compiled about A.D. 1255 and sometimes attributed to Thomas of Celano; "Light's abode, celestial Salem," a lovely gem from the fifteenth century which may have been written by Thomas à Kempis; "Come down, O Love divine," by Bianco da Siena, c. A.D. 1367, and "O sons and daughters, let us sing," written by Jean Tisserand, a Franciscan monk, who died in Paris in 1494.

Among the anonymous Latin hymns from this pre-Reformation period are "Father, we praise thee, now the night is over"; "Alleluia, song of gladness"; "Father most holy, merciful and tender"; "The strife is o'er, the battle done"; "Love of the Father, love of God the Son"; "Good Christian men, rejoice" (*In dulci jubilo*); "At the cross, her station keeping"; "Jesus Christ is risen today" (*Surrexit Christus hoide*); "O wondrous type, O vision fair"; "Long ago, and far away," an exquisite cradle song of the dialogue type sometimes rendered "Joseph dearest, Joseph mine"; and "Jerusalem, my happy home," usually credited to an unknown English writer, F.B.P., but evidently based on a medieval manuscript, *Meditationes,* from the fifteenth century. From this same manuscript is derived Johann Heerman's immortal Good Friday hymn, *Herzliebster Jesu,* which Robert Bridges, poet laureate of England, put into classical English in "Ah, holy Jesus, how hast thou offended?"

The post-Reformation period has not yielded very many Latin hymns that have found their way into evangelical hymnals. However, our collection will be the richer for "O God, I love thee; not that my poor love" from the seventeenth century, sometimes credited to St. Francis Xavier, but probably based on a Spanish poem of unknown date; "Holy God, we praise thy name," the famous German *Te Deum* of 1774 which can hardly be considered apart from the Latin original, and "Glory be to Jesus," which comes from the Italian, but which also may have been derived from a Latin source. In all of Christian hymnody there is scarcely

anything more truly devotional than Edward H. Bickersteth's version of the first of the above hymns:

O God, I love Thee; not that my poor love
May win me entrance to thy heaven above,
Nor yet that strangers to thy love must know
The bitterness of everlasting woe.

But, Jesus, thou art mine, and I am thine:
Clasped to thy bosom by thy arms divine,
Who on the cruel Cross for me hast borne
The nails, the spear, and man's unpitying scorn.

No thought can fathom and no tongue express
Thy griefs, thy toils, thy anguish measureless,
Thy death, O Lamb of God, the undefiled—
And all for me, thy wayward, sinful child.

How can I choose but love thee, God's dear Son,
O Jesus, loveliest, and most loving One!
Were there no heaven to gain, no hell to flee,
For what thou art alone I must love thee.

Not for the hope of glory or reward,
But even as thyself hast loved me, Lord,
I love thee, and will love thee and adore,
Who art my King, my God, for evermore.

From what has been written above, it will be noted that approximately fifty-seven, or nearly one-tenth of the entire collection, have come to us from the rich fountainhead of Latin hymnody. While many of these hymns have been purged by translators and hymnbook editor of much dross and accretion found in Roman doctrine, the fact that so much pure gold remains is eloquent testimony to the fact that God has had His faithful witnesses in every age who have never ceased to proclaim the saving truth that is in Christ Jesus. Truly, here is a visible token of the reality of the communion of saints and of the true unity of the Body of Christ.

GERMAN HYMNS

Inasmuch as many of the great hymns of Germany included in the Common Hymnal are already found in our respective Lutheran hymnals and therefore are familiar to most of us, we need not devote much space to this category. However, we are happy to say that Johann Franck's "Jesus, priceless treasure," which has become so popular in Norwegian and Danish circles, will be included in our collection. Better still, it will have two musical settings—the traditional Crüger chorale, *Jesu, meine Freude,* as well as the lovely lyric by Norway's L. M. Lindemann, *Gud skal alting mage.*

"O darkest woe," a hymn on the burial of our Lord by Johann Rist (1607-1667), now included in some of our hymnals, will also find wider currency among American Lutherans through our new hymnbook. The same is true of Paul Gerhardt's "Evening and morning" (*Die güldne Sonne*); Carl J. P. Spitta's "O blessed sun, whose splendor," as well as a number of other German hymns which hitherto have been popular in more limited circles.

We have already mentioned the German *Te Deum,* "Holy God, we praise thy name" (*Grosser Gott, wir loben dich*), in connection with its possible Latin origin. Strange to say, until the Missouri Synod included this magnificent hymn in its Hymnal of 1941, it had never appeared in an American Lutheran hymnbook. Was it because it made its first known appearance in the 1774 *Katholisches Gesangbuch* of Austrian Empress Maria Theresa, and therefore was regarded with suspicion? In 1935 we made the discovery that it is printed as the No. 1 hymn in the hymnal of the Lutheran Church of France, and we will not soon forget the profound impression it made upon us when we first heard it sung in St. John's Church in Paris at the third convocation of the Lutheran World Convention.

Here we may also note the rather remarkable fact that it fell to the lot of the Episcopalians in their 1940 Hymnal to introduce to American worshipers Rist's joyous Christmas hymn, "Break forth, O beauteous heavenly light," with its glorious Schop chorale harmonized by the immortal Bach. It will appear in our Common

Hymnal, though one may look for it in vain in our present American Lutheran hymnals.

Although Gerhard Tersteegen's "God himself is present" is found in some Lutheran hymnals, it will be new in other circles. It will be a real addition to our common book of worship.

SCANDINAVIAN HYMNS

The English-speaking world has a very imperfect knowledge of the Scandinavian hymn heritage. It is far more familiar with the treasury of the German hymnody. This is not due to the fact that the Scandinavian countries have not had their great spiritual poets. Johan Olof Wallin, Frans Mikael Franzen, Samuel J. Hedborn, Thomas Kingo, Nicolai Frederik Grundtvig, Hans Adolph Brorson, Magnus Brostrup Landstad and Johan N. Brun are illustrious names in the story of sacred song in the Lutheran northlands, and their lyrics are noble examples of Christian hymnody in its most exalted form. It has been the misfortune of Scandinavian hymnists, however, that they have recorded their thoughts in languages not too well known to the other peoples of Christendom. Nor have they had the benefit, as have the German hymn-writers, of such brilliant translators as Catherine Winkworth, Frances E. Cox, Jane Borthwick, Sarah Borthwick Findlater, John Wesley and Robert Bridges in rendering their lyrics into classical English.

Nevertheless, a few of the Scandinavian hymns have found their way into English and American hymnals, and the number is constantly increasing. Now comes the Common Hymnal with a representative collection of these hymns. Not all of them, perhaps, are as perfect in their English dress as might be desired, but the Commission has found it necessary to yield to nationalistic pressures on every side, sometimes against its better judgment. Nevertheless, we believe the new hymnbook will contain some real gems from the lands of northern Europe, and we are also convinced that the worship life of American Lutheranism will be definitely the richer because of this new contribution from the warmer, more

intimate, and perhaps more emotional type of song which has sprung from the soil of Scandinavian Lutheran piety. Certainly the Common Hymnal will henceforth become the English source-book for all future hymnal editors who are seeking representative material from the hymn tradition of Scandinavia.

Among Swedish hymnists, Archbishop Johan Olof Wallin was without a peer. This man, whom Longfellow described as "David's Harp in the Northland," was chiefly responsible for the famous Swedish Psalmbook in 1819, to which he contributed 128 original hymns, 13 semi-originals, 23 translations, and 178 revisions. The fact that this volume remained the official hymnal of the Church of Sweden from 1819 to 1937 without revision bears eloquent testimony to the genius of the archbishop-poet who was its chief creator. Wallin will be represented in the Common Hymnal by several hymns: "To realms of glory in the skies," "A voice, a heavenly voice I hear," "All hail to thee, O blessed morn," "Where is the friend for whom I'm ever yearning," "Unto mortal state descending," "O my soul, on wings ascending," and "We worship Thee, almighty Lord." The latter, which is one of two Wallin hymns which the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. has included in its official hymnal, is sung to a very stately and impressive chorale. Here are the words:

We worship thee, almighty Lord,
Our hearts revere thy gracious Word
When it goes forth from heaven o'er all the earth.
Holy, holy, holy art thou, O God!

Upon a mountain builded high,
Thy Church doth in thy strength rely,
And standeth sure while earth and time endure.
Holy, holy, holy art thou, O God!

Through her shall every land proclaim
The sacred might of Jesus' name,
And all rejoice with Christian heart and voice.
Holy, holy, holy art thou, O God!

All nations to thy throne shall throng,
And raise on high the victory song,
While cherubim reply to seraphim,
Holy, holy, holy art thou, O God!

Wallin's communion hymn also is beautifully impressive:

A voice, a heavenly voice I hear!
Arise, O soul, come and draw near
To hallow and revere
The day the Lord thy God doth make,
And of the bread of life partake.

I come, dear Jesus at thy word,
A guest unworthy to thy board,
My Saviour and my Lord.
O clothe me with thy righteousness,
My soul with thy salvation bless.

Olavus Petri, Sweden's Martin Luther, is represented by an Easter hymn, "O paschal feast, what joy is thine!" which is quite evidently based on a Latin original. Bishop Frans M. Franzen, a contemporary of Archbishop Wallin, has given us two fine hymns: "Prepare the way, O Zion," for Advent, and "Thine own, O loving Saviour," for holy communion. An inspiring hymn of adoration, "Glorious Majesty, before thee," comes from the same period, and is the work of Samuel Johan Hedborn, at one time a court preacher. Already known to many other Lutheran groups is the hymn of the Uppsala professor, Jakob Arrhenius, "Jesus, Lord and precious Saviour." Also known in Norwegian and Danish circles is the beautiful hymn for All Saints' Day, "In heaven above, in heaven above," written by an humble Swedish parish pastor, Laurentius L. Laurinus, at the death of his wife.

The collection will contain two Psalm paraphrases based on Swedish metrical versions: "Search me, God, and know my heart" by the late C. A. Wendell, and "Mine eyes unto the mountains" by Ernst W. Olson, both of whom have served on the Joint Hymnal Commission. The former hymn is set to a stirring chorale

by G. Wennerberg, a noted Swedish composer. We are quite certain that one of the favorites in the Common Hymnal will be "Children of the heavenly Father" by Carolina V. Sandell Berg, one of the women singers of Sweden who greatly influenced the pietist movement in the middle of the last century. Another lovely song that will appeal to many hearts is "When Christmas morn is dawning," the origin of which is veiled in obscurity.

Norway and Denmark have what might almost be designated as a common heritage. Often the hymns of one nation have been set to the music of the other. A classical example is Brorson's "Behold a host like mountains bright" which is sung to a Norwegian folksong arranged by the great composer Edvard Grieg. Even in America we find that the Churches of Norwegian and Danish background cherish the hymns of both countries with equal devotion. In the Common Hymnal will be found a considerable number of representative hymns from this heritage.

As might be expected, the Danish bishop, Nicolai Frederik Severin Grundtvig, has the largest number. Here we find his magnificent ode to the Church, "Built on the Rock, the Church doth stand," which, together with its equally glorious chorale by the Norwegian organist, Ludvig M. Lindeman, we are convinced, will find a permanent place in the Christian hymnody of America. Other hymns by Grundtvig are "God's Word is our great heritage," "The happy Christmas comes once more," "Golden light, serene and bright," "Peace to soothe our bitter woes," "Splendid are the heavens high," and "My Lord, I hear thee pleading."

Bishop Thomas Kingo, Denmark's first great hymnist, whose grandfather came from the land of Robert Burns, has contributed three to our collection: "Print thine image, pure and holy," "O Jesus, blessed Lord, to thee," and "Praise to thee and adoration."

Bishop Hans Adolph Brorson, the third in the celebrated triumvirate of Danish hymn writers, is represented only by his famous All Saints' Day hymn, "Behold a host." It is rather a pity that translators have not done a better job in rendering some of his gems into English.

Of all Danish hymn writers, perhaps none is more widely

known than Bishop Bernhardt S. Ingemann. This is due largely to his hymn, "Through the night of doubt and sorrow," which has found its way into practically every important hymnal in England and America. Another of his hymns in our collection is the lovely carol, "Christmas brings joy to every heart."

Magnus B. Landstad is Norway's outstanding hymnist and his "Kirke-Salmebog" of 1869 is the most celebrated hymnbook ever published in that country. From his pen we will find in the Common Hymnal "I know of a sleep in Jesus' name," "Great hosts of the saved from the east and the west," and "To thee, O Lord, the God of all." The latter is a gripping hymn of repentance.

Two Norwegian women hymn writers will be represented in our collection. Birgitte Boye will have two: "Rejoice, rejoice this happy morn," and "Our Lord is risen from the dead"—one for Christmas and the other for Easter, and both sung to the well-known Nicolai tune, *Wie schön leuchtet der Morgenstern*. Marie Wexelsen has a Christmas carol, "I am so glad on Christmas Eve."

Samuel O. Brun, who is claimed by both Denmark and Norway, has given us a lovely evening hymn, "The light is now fled," which is set to a Norwegian folksong of unusual beauty.

A number of hymns from Finland will be found in the new collection. The relationship between Finland and Sweden, politically, culturally and spiritually, has been quite similar to that existing between Norway and Denmark, wherefore Finland and Sweden also have what may be regarded as a common hymn heritage. However, with the development of the spirit of nationalism in Finland following World War I, a new body of native hymns has come into being. One of the greatest problems confronting the Commission has been to find satisfactory English translations of some of these lyrics. Among those finally adopted are: "Arise, my soul, arise" by Johan Kahl (1721-1746), "Lord, as a pilgrim, weary I roam" by Wilhelmi Malmivaara (1854-1922), "Jesus, hear my humble pleading" by Jenny Pohjola, and "I lift my eyes unto heaven above," a lovely children's hymn by Johann Ludvig Runeberg, who was Finland's greatest poet. Some very fine

Finnish chorale tunes, as well as Jean Sibelius' "Finlandia," will also enrich our new book of worship.

Iceland is the last of the Scandinavian lands to be represented in our collection. Hymns that have come to us from the Arctic island where Lutheranism reigns supreme include a beautiful prayer poem from the pen of Valdimar Briem, who died as recently as 1930. It reads:

Lord, let Thy Spirit, from earthly passion weaning,
Lead me along Thy will's all-holy way,
To find, by faith, on Jesus' bosom leaning,
'Mid trial, doubt and need, in him my stay.

Lord, let Thy Spirit, new love, new life bestowing,
Create a holy heart my breast within;
That I, into my Saviour's likeness growing,
May bear his image through a world of sin.

Lord, let Thy Spirit, Thy Word's deep wealth unsealing,
Lighten mine eyes with truth's celestial fire;
In life, in death, the narrow path revealing
Unto the Promised Land of our desire.

Another hymn by the same writer bears the title, "How glorious is God's greatness." Steingrimur Thorsteinsson, a contemporary of Briem, has given us a lovely evening hymn, "The fading day adorns the west." A fourth Icelandic hymn in the collection is by an older hymnist, Hallgrim Petursson, from whom we have a funeral hymn, "The Lord, our great Redeemer," in which death is pictured as the final triumph of the soul who lives in Christ.

In a concluding article, we plan to dwell on the hymn contributions from England and America, as well as other lands. We will also make some general observations regarding the music, rubrics, and other features in the Common Hymnal.

On The Question Of De-mythologizing Christianity[1]

Anders Nygren

WHEN we speak about Christ and the powers of destruction our thoughts move naturally, in the first place, to Luther and his explanation of the second article of the creed: "I believe that Jesus Christ is my Lord, who has redeemed me, a lost and condemned creature, secured and delivered me from all sins, from death, and from the power of the devil." Sin, death, and devil—these are the powers which have enslaved the life of man and lead it to destruction. But now Christ has come and delivered me and the whole human family to which I belong. He has shorn all the other powers of their might and has himself become "my Lord" so that I no longer live as a slave under *death,* but have *life* under his lordship: "in order that I might be his, live under him in his kingdom and serve him." Or to express it in the words of Luther's hymn:

Fast bound in *Satan's* chains I lay,
Death brooded darkly o'er me;
Sin was my torment night and day,
Then God beheld my wretched state
With deep commiseration;
He thought upon his mercy great,
And willed my soul's salvation.

He spoke to his beloved Son:
'Tis time to take compassion;
Then go, bright jewel of my crown,
And bring to man salvation:
From *sin* and sorrow set him free
Slay bitter *death* for him, that he
May *live* with Thee forever.

1 This article, by the author of *Eros and Agape,* appeared in the *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift,* January, 1951. It has been translated by J. W. Heikkinen, Gettysburg Theological Seminary.

Christ our liberator, Christ who conquered and cast down the powers of destruction, Christ our Lord, who gives us life and whom we may serve in freedom—this is indeed the center of the Gospel as Luther understood it.

But why should we stop with Luther? It is not he who discovered this about the powers of destruction and the Christ who came to set us free. This came to him as a message from the New Testament; in the same way it comes to us from the New Testament which is nothing else than a message of the great act of emancipation. The Gospel means "good news." It means a joyful message to those lying in prison, namely, the message which tells them: The hour of freedom has struck! You are no longer a prisoner! You are *free*—free through the victory which Christ won over the powers which held you in their thralldom.

We often use the name "Christianity" and think quite naturally that it has to do with a view, a doctrine, a conception concerning God, world, and man. This is precisely the great danger in the use of the term "Christianity"—that it favors ideas suggesting that Christianity is primarily a view or a doctrine, an ideology among other ideologies. But we should never forget that Christianity is in the first place a Gospel, therefore, a message. And we must take very seriously its message—character.

Let me illustrate what it means that the Gospel comes to us as a message by taking the example which I have often used, most recently in my "Pastoral Letter." It is taken from our time and so helps to clarify our question.

During World War II one country after another was occupied. Since this fate struck our nearest neighbors,[2] we have quite clear notions of life in an occupied land. Many of the citizens had to go underground because of fear of the officials; or they wasted away in prisons and in concentration camps. And even if they were not directly or personally involved with the occupation authorities, they yet experienced in many ways that theirs was not a free country.

2 Norway and Denmark.—Ed.

Then one day the *message* comes: Your land is *free*. The powers of occupation are defeated and are forced to flee. What, now, does this message signify? First and foremost it means, of course, that an objective change has occurred. The message tells the story of what happened: A force has arrived which is mightier than the strength of the occupation's power, and has deprived it of its lordship. But this which happened has also the most far reaching consequences for every individual in the land. All of life takes on a new form. The day of injustice and arbitrariness is past. The law which had been set aside returns to power. The change which comes for the entire country affects every person. Everyone can say: The freedom of my country means also that I personally have gotten back my freedom.

Why have I again brought in this example of an occupation? Because there is no better illustration when it comes to making clear the content of the Gospel as a glad message. One can say that it is not only an example among others, but that it is *the* example, the great universal example which has been given to our generation. We know and experience that the fact of occupation is a common reality, which exercises an influence to the outer-most parts of our life; we know and experience that the changed situation which comes in and with the overthrow of the occupying power is an opposite reality, which in a similar way reaches to the farthest areas of our life. In our generation we need only to hear the word "occupation," to hear of a nation which is controlled by hostile powers, to realize that the situation is a sad and fearful one, and we need only to hear a word about liberation from this oppression to realize that such a message signifies joy and life.

But now it is exactly the same situation which meets us in the New Testament—only with an infinitely greater scope and an infinitely deeper result upon human life. Our human existence is by nature a life under alien world powers, under hostile forces of destruction. Here in a literal sense the word of the apostle is true: "For we are not contending against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world

rulers of this present darkness" (Ephesians 6:12). In one mighty conception the New Testament embraces the whole natural life of man, all that human life which has turned away from God, under the name "this world" (ὁ κόσμος οὗτος) or "the old aeon," this age" (ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος). "This world" lies under the power of evil (I John 5:19), is under the dominion of the powers of destruction. And the powers of destruction—they are those of which Paul speaks under four names in his Epistle to the Romans: God's Wrath, Sin, Law, and Death.

In Romans 1:18 Paul speaks of *God's wrath* and how it is revealed against all godlessness. Back of life in the old aeon lies godlessness, i.e., men have turned away from God. When men in their selfishness and in their self-glorying deny the lordship of God and refuse Him obedience, they believe themselves to be free. But this is only a vain dream. When man, in sin, turns away from God, he certainly goes where he wants to go, but he is by no means free, but bound in a double sense, bound by God and bound by sin. He is bound by God, for how shall a man be able to free himself from God? He goes where he will, but at the same time he goes where God sends him. And that means that he is bound by sin. For God gives him over to sin, leaves him to the power of sin, places him under sin as his master. "Therefore God gave them up," is repeated three times in the first chapter of Romans. Such is God's wrath.

Mankind, thus, has been subjected to the power of sin. When we talk of sin, we generally think of certain moral errors or of a detestable state of mind which expresses itself in detestable acts. The Scriptures speak of sin in an entirely different way. Certainly, sin is man's own work and his perversion, but it is at the same time a power which holds him captive and leads him to destruction. Sin is a power of destruction, which exercises its influence not only on the individual but on the whole human family. When man sins he does so willingly in the consciousness that he is master over his own actions; at another time, he believes, he can decide to do otherwise and do good. But this sense of freedom with respect to sin is an illusion. "He who sins is a slave of sin."

It is not man who is dominant over sin, but it is sin which rules over man. By nature we all stand under the fearful power of sin. We live in an occupied land, and even though we imagine ourselves free, we yet remain under the domination of an alien power.

God's wrath, sin, law, death—these are the fearful powers which have enslaved human life; these are the powers of destruction which rule in the old aeon. How these work together to subject us, Paul describes in Romans 5 and in I Corinthians 15. In Romans 5:12 we read: "Therefore as sin came into the world through one man and death through sin, and so death spread to all men." And in I Corinthians 15:56: "The sting of death is sin, and the power of sin is the law." The real ruler in the old aeon is death. Therefore it is called "the last enemy" (I Corinthians 15:26). But death has its sting, its weapon, its KENTRON, with which it drives men like a herd and keeps them under its control. But that which gives sin its power, which makes sin so sharp and effective a weapon, is law (Romans 5:20). So all of humanity is subject to the terror of death and under a reign of horror. Human life carries within itself its own dissolution. All of the children of Adam are the children of death.

To us who live in this occupied land of sin, condemnation, law and death, comes now, through the Gospel, this message of God: The new aeon has broken in, the hour of freedom has struck. God through Christ has deprived the powers of destruction of their might and has given to our race a new beginning. "When a strong man fully armed, guards his own palace, his goods are in peace; but when one stronger than he assails him and overcomes him, he takes away his armor in which he trusted, and divides his spoil" (Luke 11:21). It is literally this that occurred through Christ. He came as the stronger one who overthrew sin and death and delivered their spoil. Now *he* is "our Lord," after he displaced the old rulers. In his death the power of sin and death were broken. In his resurrection the new aeon, the aeon of resurrection, had its beginning. Through Christ, God has given our race a new beginning. He has made Christ to be the head of the new humanity. The resurrection of Christ is the turning point in the history

of our race, it is the victory which means our victory and freedom. In Ephesians 1:19 ff. the apostle speaks of God's mightiest act in our existence, when he refers to "the working of his great might which he accomplished in Christ when he raised him from the dead and made him sit at his right hand in the heavenly place, far above all rule and authority and power and dominion, and above every name that is named, not only in this age but also in that which is to come, and he has put 'all things under his feet' and has made him the head over all things for the church which is his body." That which took place in Christ pertains not only to him as an individual, but affects the new humanity whose head he is and after whom "Christendom on earth" is named. He is the first, and that which occurred in him concerns everyone who believes in him and is bound to him by faith.

As the message of God's mighty deed in Christ, overcoming the power of sin and death and exalting the sovereignty of righteousness and life, the Gospel goes forth to all the world appealing to our faith. For to believe—that is to belong to Christ and to share in the life which broke through in and with his resurrection. As the natural life of man is life "in Adam"—or, it could just as well be said, death "in Adam's"—so the life of the new aeon is life "in Christ," the true life, the resurrection life. "For as by a man came death, by a man has come also the resurrection from the dead. For as 'in Adam' all die, so also 'in Christ' shall all be made alive. But each in his own order: Christ the first fruits, then, at his coming those who belong to Christ" (I Corinthians 15:21 ff.).

This is the message of the Gospel in brief summary: the curse which hangs over human life has been removed through Christ. He who believes in him and belongs to him through faith "has passed out from death to life" (John 5:24). Through Christ God "delivered us from the dominion of darkness and transferred us to the kingdom of his beloved Son" (Colossians 1:13). Everything depends on our relationship to and on our oneness with Christ. *For this reason* we are bound in faith to him, *for this reason* we are baptized in his name—so that we shall be united with him, "grown together" with him (σύμφυτοι) in a death like

his and in a resurrection like his (Romans 6:5), *for this reason* he gives himself in the Holy Communion, so that we shall be one body with him: "this is my body which is given for you."

The content of the Gospel is concentrated in this, that "the time is fulfilled," that Christ the Messiah has come, that the Messianic age has begun, that the new aeon is already an actuality, though it shall come openly, in glory, when Christ returns. With Christ the *new* has come. To John the Baptist's question: "Are you he who is to come?"—ὁ ἐρχόμενος—Messiah (Luke 7:20)—Jesus answers by pointing to the signs of the Messianic age already present (cf. Luke 4:18-21: "Today this Scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing"). Because the Kingdom of heaven has come through him, the disciples are praised "blessed," "for to them belongs the Kingdom" (Matthew 5:3, 10). It is a time of fulfillment for which generations and centuries longed: "Blessed are the eyes which see what you see. For I tell you that many prophets and kings desired to see what you see, and did not see it" (Luke 10: 23 f.). Blessed are they who can confess with Peter: "You are the Messiah, the son of the living God" (Matthew 16:16 f.) and are able to honor him as Messiah with the exclamation: "Blessed be 'he who is coming'" (ὁ ἐρχόμενος). The blessedness of the disciples consists herein that they are able to have a part in the new Kingdom. The least in the new aeon is greater than the greatest in the old (Matthew 11:11; Luke 7:28). The band of disciples is indeed a "little flock" scattered in the old aeon with its concentrated opposition, but it need not fear because—says Jesus—"It is your father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom (Luke 12:32)—the Kingdom of heaven is theirs and thereby all things are new. "Therefore, if any one is in Christ, he is a new creation; the old has passed away, behold the new has come" (II Corinthians 5:17). Through Christ the new creation has appeared, and he who is "in Christ" shares in the new creation; he is himself a new κτίσις.

It is clear that in this presentation of the central Christian message we followed the New Testament as closely as possible,

but that thereby we brought into the foreground those aspects of the Christian faith which seem most strange to the average man of our day. It is easy to select particular statements from the New Testament which appeal directly to the modern mind. If one isolates these and eliminates the rest of the New Testament, one can indeed achieve a "Christianity for our time." Our task here, however, was to recover most accurately the determinative features of the Christian message in its original form. We, then, cannot escape the fact that it is precisely the original meaning of the Gospel which presents the great difficulty for the common man of today. What the Gospel talks about strikes him as something unreal. He looks on it as a mythological presentation or a legendary elaboration of a reality which precisely in this form becomes incomprehensible. What shall the ordinary person of our day make of this talk of the two aeons? What shall he do with the notion of Christ and Adam, or of the powers of destruction, the reign of sin and death over the natural life of man, or of righteousness, and the lordship of life through Christ? What use has he for the cross of Christ and his vicarious suffering, for Christ's resurrection and his exaltation? Does he not look upon all these ideas as unreal, merely words that remain after the ideas behind them have lost their meaning for the un-mythological thought of modern man?

Recently wide discussion has arisen over the question of the "de-mythologizing of the New Testament," with serious consequences. It should be clear from the previous presentation that the question under consideration is not an artificial issue, but an actual problem. The Christian message seeks still to be a message for the modern man. But if it cannot be considered as an actual message, but only as an expression of the mythological imagery of a past age, which the modern man cannot employ, then the message does not reach him and is of no effect.

One can, indeed, hardly say that the discussion concerning "de-mythologizing" has actually clarified the problem. The reason for this lies in the fact that the discussion has been too much determined by the alternatives originally stated, which however,

upon a closer examination prove to be false alternatives. On the one hand there has been a demand for as thorough a de-mythologizing of the New Testament as possible. In this case one must certainly be conscious of the risk not only of eliminating the mythology but the kerygma itself, though it is thought possible to avoid this risk through *"eine existentielle Interpretation der mythologischen Begrifflichkeit"* in terms of *Seinverständnis* and *Selbtsverständnis* (R. Bultman).[3] On the other hand it is claimed that such a de-mythologizing leads by necessity to the dissolution of the message. *"Es ist die Frage, ob wir je dem Mythos entgehen können"* (J. Schniewind).[4] *"Ist Mythologie nicht eine Form unseres Denkens deren wir uns niemals entledigen können?"* (H. Thielecke).[5]

This antithesis is unfortunate and false. It gives the impression that the New Testament was built on myths and that our problem is either to determine how much of the mythological must or should be retained, or to adopt an interpretation which totally eliminates the mythological element. The starting point is actually quite different. The message of the New Testament, even as we have already sketched it in its most sharpened form, has nothing to do with mythology. We and our age are not first to discover that there exists an opposition between *myth* and *truth,* between *myth* and *actuality.* The New Testament itself makes this distinction between truth, ἡ ἀλήθεια which it proclaims, and myths, οἱ μύθοι which it rejects (II Timothy 4:4). And in II Peter 1:16 the reality of the Gospel is set over against cunning, deceitful myths: "For we did not follow cleverly devised myths when we made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we were eyewitnesses of his majesty." For the New Testament it is of decisive importance that its message is truth and reality and not some myth.

If now, in spite of this, the message of the New Testament

3 "An existential interpretation of what is conceived in mythological form," in terms of "the understanding of Being and of the understanding of Self."

4 "It is a question if we ever can avoid myth."

5 "Is not mythology a form of our thinking which we can never do without?"

strikes the modern man as mainly mythological, the reason is that we approach the New Testament with presuppositions which are not native to it, and therefore misunderstand its message. If the Gospel is taken as something mythological, that in itself proves that it has been falsely preached or falsely understood. We should not allow ourselves to be satisfied with a preaching and an interpretation of the Gospel which presents it—what it is not—a myth. In this respect a "de-mythologizing" on a grand scale is called for. It is to the credit of Bultmann that he has recognized this problem and made it so prominent. But his limitation is that he has viewed it almost entirely in the perspective of the Enlightenment, so that his whole attempt easily suggests a thought world of the remote past. "De-mythologizing" should not be done the way Bultmann thinks of it. It is not the New Testament which needs to be de-mythologized but our modern view of Christianity which falsely mythologizes the Christian message. What actually happens when one seeks to de-mythologize the New Testament is that the truth and the reality of the Gospel is translated into a modern myth. In the Gospel the question is not about *Seinverständnis* and *Selbstverständnis* and a *Heilsgeschehen*[6] which makes these possible, but it is a question of a purely realistic redemption through God's work in this our real world. That which hinders us from understanding the Gospel in its genuine realism and from hearing its message as a proclamation of a reality which totally changes the basic condition of our life, is the persistence of certain modern ways of thought which because they are so common seem to be self-evident. One might with good reason designate this as the myth of our time, the "myth of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries." The real "myth of the twentieth century," however, has nothing to do with Alfred Rosenberg's use of that phrase. The "myth of the twentieth century" consists of those ideas which are taken as self-evident by our time, the self-evident presuppositions by which it lives. In themselves these presuppositions are not objectively necessary. Their necessity is psychological which has

6 Act of redemption.

made them appear relatively indispensable. Each epoch can see only through its own eyes, it has no others by which to see. It is not itself conscious of what its self-evident presuppositions are. Were it to perceive them, then they would no longer seem self-evident. But these self-evident presuppositions, which constitute the characteristic myth of our time, limit the range of our vision and make the Gospel unintelligible for us. What is needed is not that the Gospel be interpreted into the terms of contemporary myth—that would merely make our limitation a standard by which the Gospel is to be judged. It is inevitable that such an adjustment of the Gospel to contemporary ideas does occur but we should never forget that herein lies the *limitation* in our understanding of the Gospel. Future generations will be astonished to discover on how meager spiritual food we have been able to live—as we wonder at the spiritual dearth of the period of Enlightenment, after its self-evident presuppositions have ceased to be obvious to us. They will wonder at the fact that with our mastery of nature we permitted ourselves to be enslaved by it. They will wonder at our primitive categories which classified the reality of the Gospel along with myth. The "de-mythologizing" which however needs to be carried out consists in the removal of the dubious presuppositions or—let us say it bluntly—the mythology of the modern mind which transforms the reality of the Gospel, contrary to its clear meaning, into myth.

This kind of "de-mythologizing" of the modern mind for the purpose of bringing out the actual message of the Gospel is most difficult to achieve—precisely for the reason that we are unconsciously and unconditionally bound to the self-evident presuppositions of our time. There will always be barriers to our understanding of the Gospel. But we should not make of these barriers a principle of interpretation. To a certain degree, though, it is possible to liberate ourselves from the prejudgments of our own age. We are at present passing through a period of spiritual upheaval in which many things, only recently considered self-evident, have lost their self-evident qualities.

To cite but a single example, consider *individualism*. For a

long time the individualistic conception of man reigned unquestioned, as self-evident, but it is no longer so. For our present purpose we may disregard the issue of the validity or the non-validity of the collectivistic or more organic conceptions which seek to take its place. The main thing to notice is that the individualistic conception of man no longer remains unquestioned, its claim to being self-evident is no longer accepted.

When the protagonist of the individualistic myth encounters Paul's teaching concerning Christ and Adam (Romans 5), he is forced by his presuppositions to ask: "What kind of speculation is this? What strange myths are these? That an individual at the dawn of history should be able to involve all other individuals in the consequences of his act! Or that another individual, in the midst of the history of the human race, could bring about opposite consequences for those who believe in him!" In line with this type of thinking theologians have often spoken about the apostle's Adam-Christ speculations. This would be correct reasoning—if the presuppositions of individualism were right and inevitable. But just this is the very issue under debate. Our generation has had to experience the fateful solidarity of the life of humanity. It can no longer maintain the illusion of a self-glorying, exclusively self-centered individual. It has had to learn the reality of an "occupation." It has come to know how an objective power outside of ourselves can exert its influence to the very outermost areas of our life, bringing us under its control.

When one has realized this, then he has freed himself from the myth of individualism—and come very near to the realities of the New Testament.

In any discussion of the meaning of sin the individualist can think only in terms of his own presuppositions and conceive of a sovereign individual determining his own position, but he is unable to recognize sin as a power which rules over him. Again, in his consideration of death, he recognizes it as a concrete event which terminates the individual's life, but he fails to see how death's fate rests upon the entire life of man and sets its stamp upon all of life and not only on the last moment.

The message of the Gospel deals with the simple realities of human existence. It is concerned over those things about which we must say: they *are* so. He who does not believe in God may call them by other names and interpret them differently. But the basic realities are there, since human life is what it is. A one-sided modern myth has stopped with things on the surface of life. The New Testament knows also the depth-dimension of life and its realities. When preaching fulfills its mission, then it penetrates to these realities. We exaggerate the incapacity of modern man's ability to recognize spiritual realities if we assume that he can understand only such an interpretation of the Gospel as accords with his myth. Unless all signs fail, we have already touched the low point in the matter of spiritual understanding. Many signs indicate that we are moving into a period which will find it easier to come into contact with the Gospel than the era just past—not in the form of a churchly awakening, but rather in a general openness to the message of the Gospel. Probably this is as yet least evident in our own country,[7] where we rather must speak of a certain spiritual lag—not unnatural since to a great extent we have lived on the margin of the vast historical events which have shaken the world. Certainly there is very little occasion now to accommodate the Gospel to attitudes which yesterday seemed self-evident, but today have lost this obviousness. If only the preaching of the Word points out clearly the realities of which the Gospel treats, then the Gospel will show itself to be God's power unto salvation also for our time. The world in which we live is the world of sin and death. But it is also the world into which God sent him "who abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel," and of this Gospel we have been appointed preachers (II Timothy 1:10 f.).

7 Sweden.—Ed.

Luther's View Concerning The Imperial Foreign Policy

George W. Forell

THE STUDY of Luther and the Reformation has always been particularly subject to the changes of fashion. The Enlightenment, the Romantic movement, Pietism and Rationalism, Marxism and Nazism all have given us their own peculiar interpretation of Reformation history. It is therefore with hesitation that I suggest that it would be possible to interpret the development of the Reformation in terms of the successes and failures of the foreign policy of Emperor Charles V. Though Charles and the empire had little or no influence upon the ideological development of the Reformation, considerations determined largely by foreign policy dominated the emperor's dealings with the reformer and his followers. There can be no doubt that had it been in the emperor's power and had political considerations not interfered Charles would have exterminated Luther and Lutheranism with all the power at his command. His statement to the princes at Worms makes his personal views abundantly clear. There he said: "My predecessors the most Christian emperors of German race, the Austrian archdukes, and dukes of Burgundy, were until death the truest sons of the Catholic church, defending and extending their belief to the glory of God, the propagation of the faith, the salvation of their souls. They have left behind them the holy Catholic rites, that I should live and die therein, and so until now, with God's aid, I have lived, as becomes a Christian Emperor. What my forefathers established at Constance and other councils, it is my privilege to uphold. A single monk, led astray by private judgment, has set himself against the faith held by all Christians for a thousand years and more, and impudently concludes that all Christians up till now have erred. I have therefore

resolved to stake upon this cause all my dominions, my friends, my body, and my blood, my life and soul." And turning to the assembled princes he continued, "For myself and you, sprung from the holy German nation, appointed by peculiar privilege defenders of the faith, it would be a grievous disgrace, an eternal stain upon ourselves and our posterity, if in this our day, not only heresy, but its very suspicion, were due to our neglect. After Luther's stiff-necked reply in my presence yesterday, I now repent that I have so long delayed proceedings against him and his false doctrines. I have now resolved never again, under any circumstances to hear him. Under protection of his safe conduct he shall be escorted home, but forbidden to preach and to seduce men with his evil doctrines and incite them to rebellion. I warn you to give witness to your opinion as good Christians and in accordance with your vows."[1] There were many political reasons which would have made a less outspoken condemnation of Luther desirable. Charles V's ambassador in Rome, Juan Manuel, suggested in a letter of May 2, 1520, that the emperor would do well to show some favor to Luther.[2] Luther was giving the pope trouble and thus made it possible for the emperor to bargain with the papacy for political advantage. However, Luther attacked all the spiritual values which Charles cherished, the unity of the Church and the continuity of her rites. The only possible policy which Charles could follow in view of his own religious convictions was the extermination of Luther and all he stood for. That Charles was never able to accomplish this goal was largely the result of very mundane considerations of foreign policy.

Francis I, the French king who had failed to win the imperial crown in spite of the support of Pope Leo X and a number of German princes, was making sure that Charles would not enjoy the crown which Francis had desired. Immediately upon the end

1 Edward Armstrong: *The Emperor Charles V*, 2 volumes (London: Macmillan, 1902); see also Karl Brandi: *Kaiser Karl V*, II edition (München, 1938), p. 112 and Peter Rassow: *Die Kaiser-Idee Karls V* (Berlin, 1932), p. 26 ff.

2 Leopold von Ranke: *History of the Reformation in Germany*, translated by Sarah Austin (London, 1905), p. 234.

of the Diet of Worms there began the conflict between Charles V and Francis I which made any effective enforcement of the edict of Worms impossible. Dependent upon help from the Germans,[3] Charles was in no position to alienate large and powerful sections of the German people. Furthermore, the existence of the Evangelical movement gave him a strong argument which could be used to keep Leo X from following his natural inclinations towards an alliance with France. The temporary alliance of pope and emperor, though the result of many considerations, was aided by the hope of some of the papal advisers—if not the pope himself—that cooperation with Charles would make him more eager to stamp out the Lutheran heresy.[4]

Against all expectations, Charles V defeated the French king decisively. The Peace of Madrid gave the emperor hope that he would now be able to deal with the enemies of the Christian faith, the Turks and "the heretics who have torn themselves from the bosom of the Holy Church."[5] A prolonged peace would have enabled him to enforce the Edict of Worms. But by now the papal throne was occupied by Clement VII who allied himself openly with the king of France in opposition to the emperor. Again Charles became involved in lengthy warfare which drove him to the side of the German Lutherans against the Papacy. When the German princes and cities met at Speier in 1526 they felt free to disregard the anti-evangelical proclamation which the emperor had sent from Seville. In his proclamation the emperor had defended the cause of the papacy. But in view of the fact that when these instructions arrived emperor and pope were engaged in battle against each other, the "Protestants" at the Diet chose to ignore the imperial instructions. They were convinced that the political events in Italy must have changed the emperor's mind. Under those circumstances the Diet of Speier decided that every-

3 E.g., Franz von Sickingen, one of Luther's early sympathizers, was instrumental in defeating Robert de la Mark, who attacked Charles V's possessions in the Netherlands. See Armstrong, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 129, 130.

4 Leopold von Ranke: *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation,* Phaidon, Vienna, p. 239. This exchange is omitted in the English translation.

5 Ranke, *op. cit.* (English), p. 417.

body should act in "such wise as he could answer it to God and the emperor."[6]

Again the Reformation was saved by the international political situation. The pope's alliance against the emperor made it necessary for Charles to hire German Lutherans to fight his battle against Rome. It was of some significance that many of these German soldiers felt that in fighting the enemy of the emperor they were also fighting the Anti-Christ who had perverted the church of God. When finally Rome itself fell into their hands without any significant resistance, these men were convinced that God Himself had led them to victory.[7] The war ended two years later. And now it seemed as if the emperor would finally be able to enforce the Edict of Worms. And in the treaty of Barcelona Charles and Ferdinand promised the pope that they would subdue the heretics.[8] But by now this task, which might have been simple in 1521, seemed almost impossible without a great deal of bloodshed. At Worms Luther had not had a single prince openly taking his side. His own elector seemed more interested in the defense of the reputation of the university of Wittenberg than in Luther's contemplated reformation of the Church. The eight years between the Diet of Worms and the second Diet of Speier gave the Reformation the necessary time to consolidate its gains and to organize its adherents.[9] And although it seemed obvious that the anti-reformation forces far outnumbered the Protestants, foreign political considerations made inadvisable an all-out effort to stamp out Protestantism. The danger which threatened Christendom from the Turks and which was highlighted by the siege of Vienna in 1529 forced Charles to seek the support of the Lutheran princes. Under these circumstances it was understandable that Charles V agreed to the truce of Nurnberg which granted the Protestants freedom of religion until a general council could meet and decide the matters at issue. It is noteworthy that even Alexander, one of

6 *Ibid.*, p. 428.

7 Brandi, *op. cit.*, p. 218; Ranke, *op. cit.*, p. 442.

8 Brandi, *op. cit.*, p. 239; Armstrong, *op. cit.* Vol. I, p. 188.

9 Hermann Baumgarten: *Karl V und die deutsche Reformation,* Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte (Halle, 1889), p. 45; Brandi, *op. cit.*, p. 262.

the Reformation's oldest and most intelligent enemies, suggested that concessions to the Lutherans were the only means of keeping their support against the Turks.[10] And Loayasa, the emperor's confessor, advised him in 1532 to tolerate the Lutherans if they would help him against the common enemy. He wrote, "Let your Majesty have no scruples in making use of them, heretics as they may be, for if your heart is free from sin, their errors will not disturb your own good fortune."[11]

From then on until the death of Luther and the Schmalkald war the imperial policy was largely dominated by a desire for peace, and no real effort was made to enforce the Edict of Worms in the Protestant states. For even when the acute danger from the Turks temporarily receded, there was always danger that the alliance between Francis I and Suleiman might attempt to draw in the disaffected Lutheran princes of Germany. Furthermore, the emperor's personal disappointments with the spiritual leadership of the church, whose defender he had believed himself to be, made the course of toleration the only feasible one.[12] Even though Charles V eventually defeated the League of Schmalkald he did not use his victory for the re-introduction of the Roman religion. By that time the Reformation was an accomplished fact. It seems that Armstrong is justified in saying: "Lutheranism owed its political existence as much to Clement VII as to the French and the Turks. His weak and crooked policy, strong and consistent only in opposition to ecclesiastical reform, had given it time, and time is the requisite of revolution. The German Reformation had not only both extended and consolidated its political forces, but had defined its doctrines and moderated them into a working possibility, shaking off the odium of violent extremes, socialist or anarchist. More than this—Clement had lamed the enterprise and perhaps injured the character of the most honorable champion of the Church. Charles had been at first straightforward in his atti-

10 Armstrong, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 254.

11 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 255; Brandi, *op. cit.*, p. 272.

12 Walter Rosenberg: *Der Kaiser und die Protestanten in den Jahren 1537-1539*, Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte, XX, 1902/1903, No. 77. Armstrong, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 162.

tude towards the religious revolution. He had given Luther a hearing and then frankly declared war in defense of the Church. But the later hostility of Clement, combining with that of Francis I, had driven him into subterfuge and concession—into an attitude of toleration inconsistent with his real convictions."[13]

It seems to be the judgment of history that the survival of the Reformation in the critical stages of its infancy was the direct result of the difficulties which Emperor Charles V had in his relations with the papacy, France and the Turks. In how far did Luther, the champion of the Reformation, comprehend the significance of the international events for his movement? Was he ever aware of the fact that its survival was largely the result of the efforts of Francis I, Clement VII, and Suleiman the Magnificent to interfere with the plans of Emperor Charles V?

In order to understand Luther's personal reaction to the foreign policy of Charles V, which proved so important for his life and work, it is essential to remember that Luther did not approach history as the result of the manipulation of power by individual leaders, or the natural process of rise and decline of nations according to their racial vitality, or even as the struggle for markets and the control of the means of production, but history was for him the place where a sovereign God is at work punishing nations and rulers for their sins and disobedience. Like an Old Testament prophet Luther saw all history as the direct expression of the divine will. It is for this reason that he advocated the study of history. History teaches that God always fulfills His threats and promises. Thus the study of history nourishes faith and puts the

13 Armstrong, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 266 f. Cf. Baumgarten, *op. cit.*, p. 13. In the last addition to his last will and testament (Sept. 9, 1558) Charles counselled his heirs to liquidate the Lutherans. See Karl Brandi: *Berichte und Studien zur Geschichte Karl V*, Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen aus dem Jahre 1930, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, pp. 269, 275. See also Brandi, *Kaiser Karl V*, p. 427, where Don Diego Mendoza, the ambassador at Venice is quoted as follows: "Alle Welt weiss, dass nur der Papst Euch in alle früheren und gegenwärtigen Schwierigkeiten gebracht hat. Welcher Fürst hat Euch mehr geschadet als er? Die Blinden vermögen zu sehen, dass auf ihn alles zurückgeht, was der Franzose Euch angetan hat, und folglich auch alle Untat der Türken."

fear of God into the hearts of men.[14] He said, "It would be most useful for rulers if from childhood on they would read history books—both pagan and holy history."[15] Historical records are memorials to God's works and judgments. They show how He preserves the world and man in particular, and they reveal how He rules, hindering and helping, punishing and honoring.[16] Emperors and kings are therefore under an obligation to have the history of their time recorded and preserved in libraries. And the historians are "the most useful people and the best teachers so that it is impossible ever to honor and praise and thank them sufficiently."[17]

Luther believed that his own personal fate was part of this divine plan at work in history. God had protected him against the pope and all tyrants because God wanted him to proclaim the Gospel.[18] It was God's plan which was at work in his life and in the history of his time. Charles V, Francis I, Clement VII, and Suleiman the Magnificent were all tools in the hands of God. Though they all might be personally evil men and destined for eternal damnation, God could use them and even their most evil efforts to show His power and glory. Thus Luther explained the 124th Psalm, verses 4 and 5, "Then the waters had overwhelmed us, the stream had gone over our souls. Then the proud waters had gone over our souls," with the following words: "The Roman Pope Clement had moved all oceans, as if to devour all churches and the devil had risked everything and sent many thousand devils to Augsburg which were to goad the princes into suppressing us. There were floods of water but He who is Lord over pope and devil desired that their godless thoughts be in vain."[19] Luther's faith in the sovereignty of God made him look at history with a great deal of detachment. Historical decisions could not affect the

14 Martin Luther, *Werke,* Kritische Gesammtausgabe (Weimar, 1883-), (WA), Volume 25, page 141, line 37.
15 *Ibid.,* Volume 6, page 261, line 16.
16 *Ibid.,* 50,384,2.
17 *Ibid.,* 50,384,15.
18 *Ibid.,* 18,313,22.
19 *Ibid.,* 40,144,34.

divine plan, they could affect only the place of nations and individuals within this divine plan. The imperial attitude towards the Gospel did not decide the fate of the Gospel, but it did decide the fate of the empire. This is the perspective from which Luther views the policies of Charles V and his contemporaries.[20]

Personally Luther liked the emperor. One could almost consider Luther's attitude towards Charles V as the great political illusion of his life. We know that Charles immediately disliked Luther. He is supposed to have said about him: "This man will never make a heretic out of me."[21] Yet Luther's reaction to Charles was quite positive. He spoke of him as a "true father of Germany."[22] He appreciated his real concern for the unity of the church[23] and his modesty and consideration.[24] He also had some rather exaggerated notions of Charles' chastity.[25] Luther made it a point to praise Charles in comparison with his brother Ferdinand,[26] a man whom he intensely disliked and called the "pestilence of Germany."[27] All Christians should intercede in prayer for Charles[28] particularly since Luther considered him surrounded by evil priests who advised him badly. Luther said, "Dear Emperor Charles is surrounded by so many devils, evil priests, godless bishops and princes that they drive him into decisions which are not his own."[29] "He is rendered ineffective because of the scoundrels and evil-doers that surround him, particularly that arch-criminal Pope Clement."[30] Yet Luther appreciated that the emperor had prevented bloodshed in Germany by his restrained actions.[31] And he praised his behavior at Augsburg.[32] With evi-

20 *Ibid.*, 15,32; cf. Tischreden 2,1796.
21 Ranke, *op. cit.*, p. 242.
22 Luther, *op. cit.*, Tischreden 2,645,12.
23 *Ibid.*, Tischreden 3,31,28.
24 *Ibid.*, Tischreden 4,15,10 and 4,631,15.
25 *Ibid.*, Tischreden 5,598,30.
26 *Ibid.*, Tischreden 2,599,22.
27 *Ibid.*, Tischreden 3,596,21 and 3,679,25.
28 *Ibid.*, Tischreden 2,645,15 and 2,570,7.
29 *Ibid.*, 32,182,17.
30 *Ibid.*, 30 (3),297,26.
31 *Ibid.*, 38,119,14.
32 *Ibid.*, 30 (3),291 ff.

dent satisfaction he quoted alleged sayings of the emperor which made him appear favorable to Luther's cause. The emperor was supposed to have said that Luther's teaching could not be so evil "since so many great, honest and learned people had accepted it."[33] And also, "If the priests were pious they would not need a Luther."[34]

But at the same time Luther could not close his eyes to the obvious efforts of the emperor on behalf of the Roman church. Especially his promise to the pope to restore all losses to him[35] confused and annoyed Luther. He attributed this tendency to bad counsel from his clerical advisers, calling him "a lamb among sows, dogs, and devils."[36] He also blamed the influence of Spain and a congenital tendency to be overly deliberate and somewhat dull. But even in this tendency he saw some good. He said, "We have a pious emperor. He is pious and quiet. I take it that he doesn't talk as much in one year as I talk in one day."[38] Yet it was this hesitancy which led Luther to criticize him most severely. Charles hesitated against the Turks before Vienna and did not make the most of his military opportunities. Similarly Luther felt that he did not exploit his advantage after his victory at the Ticino.[40] And Luther was most critical of his peace and treaty with the king of France.[41]

In the conflict with France Luther was impartial in his sympathy. He felt that the emperor should be strong and make his will felt among the other princes of Christendom. With approval he quoted the statement of Fabian von Feilizsch who had said to Frederick the Wise after the election of Charles V, "The ravens need a vulture."[42] Furthermore he intensely disliked the French

33 *Ibid.*, 30 (3),292,21.
34 *Ibid.*, 30 (3),294.20.
35 *Ibid.*, 30 (2),409,34.
36 *Ibid.*, 30 (3),196,29 and 40 (3),148,17.
37 *Ibid.*, Tischreden 4,151,44.
38 *Ibid.*, Tischreden 2,182,1 and 3,233,5.
39 *Ibid.*, 43,417,31 and 44,181,15.
40 *Ibid.*, 41,181,12.
41 *Ibid.*, Tischreden 4,34,7.
42 *Ibid.*, Tischreden 6,49,18.

king. The reasons were numerous. He considered him personally immoral[43]—and indeed compared with him Charles was a model of chastity. Furthermore, Francis was allied with the enemies of the Christian world, the Turks, and Luther felt that it would be fair to call him "Turcissimus."[44] He was violent in his persecution of the adherents of the Reformation, and Luther claimed that Francis personally set fire to the stake when Evangelicals were murdered.[45] And last, but not least, he was an ally of Clement VII. Luther said that soldiers had told him that the catastrophe that befell Francis at the battle of Pavia was the direct result of the fact that he had the troops of the pope with him.[46] All this fitted perfectly into Luther's general conception of history. And he would say that we can see in the story of the king of France that trust in arms is vain indeed.[47] For Francis was defeated in spite of his superiority in men and armor, in spite of his tremendous expenditures for espionage.[48]

Luther never changed his view of Francis and his policies in spite of the approaches of the king in the direction of the Schmalkald League. When in 1535 the king of France asked Melanchthon to come to his country to help settle the affairs of the church, Luther heartily endorsed the trip, not because he had changed his mind concerning the French king, but rather because he hoped that such a visit by Melanchthon might alleviate the hard lot of the Evangelicals in France.[49] Of Francis and Henry VIII Luther said that they were Lutherans in "taking" but not in giving. "They only seek their own, not what is God's."[50] There is good reason to believe that it was Luther's influence which prevented the Schmalkald League from following a policy which would have allied them completely with France and Turkey against the German emperor. Through this attitude, as Armstrong says,

43 *Ibid.*, Tischreden 4,151,43.
44 *Ibid.*, Tischreden 5,131,17.
45 *Ibid.*, Tischreden 6,12,5.
46 *Ibid.*, 30 (2),114,16.
47 *Ibid.*, 17 (1),325,2.
48 *Ibid.*, Tischreden 3,121,19.
49 *Ibid.*, Briefe, 7,229 (August 17, 1535, Nr. 2221 Luther to Elector John Frederick).
50 *Ibid.*, Tischreden 3,112,23.

"Luther's conservative common sense and his German patriotism saved the emperor's cause and perhaps that of Christianity."[51]

It is even less surprising that Luther sided wholeheartedly with the emperor in his conflict with Clement VII and the papacy. Luther did not attack all popes with equal bitterness. Of Leo X he said that he was an example of how a person could be corrupted by his election to the papacy.[52] He believed that Adrian VI had been elevated because of his personal friendship with the emperor and in order to utilize his influence over Charles V against the Evangelicals.[53] Luther was convinced that the election of this pope was very largely the result of the fear of the consequences of his attacks against the institution of the papacy. Adrian was not the target that Leo had been and that Clement was going to be. Though he attacked him bitterly for his hypocrisy,[54] he also reported a rumor that Adrian had been murdered because he confessed himself an adherent of the Gospel.[55]

But there was no doubt in Luther's mind that Clement VII was an arch-criminal.[56] With scorn he reported how the pope had sent help to France against the emperor,[57] and he attempted to explain this Franco-phile policy by mentioning the marriage of Clement's daughter to a French prince.[58] Politically he considered him anti-German and claimed that Clement desired to wade in German blood.[59] Luther quoted him as having said that rather than stop persecuting the Evangelicals he would send the Turks into Germany.[60] Analyzing the pope's foreign policy in a letter to the archbishop of Mainz, Luther found in Clement an additional example of God's power over history.[61] His loss of Rome[62]

51 Armstrong, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 252.
52 Luther, *op. cit.*, Tischreden 2,237,10.
53 *Ibid.*, Tischreden 5,513,23.
54 *Ibid.*, 15,184,14.
55 *Ibid.*, 39 (2),382,18 and Briefe, 2,247,31.
56 *Ibid.*, 30 (3),297,28; cf. Tischreden 2,184,25 and 3,234,13.
57 *Ibid.*, 52,232,17.
58 *Ibid.*, Tischreden 3,556,25.
59 *Ibid.*, 30 (3),298,24.
60 *Ibid.*, Tischreden 2,482,25.
61 *Ibid.*, 30 (2),411.
62 *Ibid.*, 30 (2),115,9.

and his eventual downfall[63] were welcomed with much satisfaction. Indicative of his sympathies in the conflict between Charles V and Clement VII were Luther's laudatory references to Georg von Frundsberg, the German leader of the imperial forces who was instrumental in bringing about the humiliation of the papacy.[64]

As far as Pope Paul III was concerned, Luther claimed that he had induced the Turks to war against Germany,[65] and he commented scornfully on the pope's Bull of Indulgence for the war against the Turks.[66]

But while Luther's opinions concerning the political strife between the emperor and the king of France and the emperor and the various popes were the rather inconsequential views of a Wittenberg professor of theology on the international situation, his views on Charles V's duties and responsibilities in relation to the Turks were of the greatest significance. For in this realm Luther was in a position to influence important powers within the Germen empire in their policies, especially his own elector and the Schmalkald League. It is through his views of the Turks and the imperial foreign policy towards the Turks that his opinions on foreign affairs became of the greatest importance.

There had been early efforts by Luther's enemies to claim that he favored a Turkish victory and advocated a pacifist attitude towards this enemy of Christendom. Pope Leo X in his bull *Exsurge Domini* of June 15, 1520, had implied that since Luther considered the Turks a punishment from God over an apostate Christendom, he was opposing the defense of the Western world against the Turkish danger.[67] Fortunately for Christendom, this allegation was unjustified. Quite on the contrary Luther advocated the military defense of the empire against the Turks in three major writings: *On War against the Turk, Call to War against*

63 *Ibid.*, Tischreden 2,621,27.
64 *Ibid.*, 30 (2),571,26; cf. Tischreden 2,652,24 and 5,31,12.
65 *Ibid.*, Tischreden 2,233,25.
66 *Ibid.*, 50,111.
67 Cf. George W. Forell: "Luther and the War Against the Turks," *Church History*, Volume XIV, No. 4.

the Turk, and *Exhortation to Prayer against the Turk.*[68] However, he insisted that such a defense would have to be directed by the emperor as the rightful ruler of Germany.[69] It was bound to fail if the emperor should attempt to fight against the Turks as a protector of the Christian faith and the Christian church, or if the just war in the defense of the empire should degenerate into a religious crusade under clerical leadership. On the first point Luther said, "The emperor is not the head of Christendom or the defender of the Gospel and of faith. The Christian church and the Christian faith need a far different protector than an emperor or a king."[70] He ridiculed the notion that the emperor is needed as a protector of the Christian faith by saying, "Here you can see how a poor mortal, a future victim of worms, like the emperor, who is not sure of his life for even one moment, glorifies himself as the true protector of the Christian Faith. Scripture says that the Christian faith is a rock, too solid to be overthrown by the might of the devil, by death and all powers; that this faith is a divine power. Such a power should be protected by a child of death who can be put to death by any kind of disease? Help us God, the world is crazy . . . well, soon we shall have a king or prince who will protect Christ and then somebody else will protect the Holy Ghost and then of course the Holy Trinity and Christ and Faith will be in fine shape."[71]

And he was similarly revolted by the notion of a crusade, since this would imply that there would be an army of Christians fighting against the enemies of Christ. Luther said, "Such a view is opposed to Christ's teaching and name. It is against His teachings, since He said that Christians should not resist evil, should not quarrel and fight and should never seek revenge. It is against His name, since in such an army there are hardly five real Christians and perhaps many people worse in the sight of God than the Turks. Yet they all want to go by the name of Christians. This is the worst of all sins, a sin that no Turk commits. For here

68 Luther, *op. cit.,* 30 (2),107 (Philadelphia Edition Volume V) ; 30 (2),160, 51,577 f.
69 *Ibid.,* 30 (2),129,17.
70 *Ibid.,* 30 (2),130,27.
71 *Ibid.,* 15,278,1.

Christ's name is used for sin and unrighteousness."[72] And Luther warned all soldiers against participation in a crusade. "If I were a soldier," he said, "and should see as the flag of my army the colors of a cleric or a cross, even if it were a crucifix, I would run away as if the very devil himself were after me."[73] But while he disapproved of a crusade or holy war against the Turks in defense of Christ and the Christian faith, Luther called to war against the Turks in defense of the German empire, of law and order and of home and family.[74] And from this point of view Luther made some very constructive suggestions for the defense of the empire. He called for unity among the rulers, since the Sultan is so very powerful that no king of country can withstand him in isolation.[75] And he reminded them that the Turkish empire is greater and more powerful than Spain, France, England, Germany, Italy, Bohemia, Hungary, Poland, and Denmark all taken together.[76] He criticized those princes severely who put the special tax for the war against the Turks into their own pockets and did not supply the needed help.[77]

He also encouraged the individual citizens to fight to the last breath, and he hoped that even the smallest village would not let itself be captured without a fight. Everybody should help in the defense, young and old alike.[78] All this willingness to cooperate with the emperor is the more surprising in view of the fact that Luther was rightfully suspicious about the manner in which the war was being fought. The fact that the pope considered the war against the Turks his personal affair constantly annoyed Luther. Before he had any specific damaging evidence he had claimed that the princes could not succeed in their war against the Turks because they were dominated by the pope.[79] But later he expressed the suspicion that seemingly only Lutherans were being sent into

72 *Ibid.*, 30 (2),111,13.
73 *Ibid.*, 30 (2),115,1.
74 *Ibid.*, 30 (2),180,7.
75 *Ibid.*, 30 (2),129,25 and 147,9.
76 *Ibid.*, 30 (2),146,7.
77 *Ibid.*, 53,558,11.
78 *Ibid.*, 30 (2),183,18.
79 *Ibid.*, Tischreden 2,320,6; see also Tischreden 1,448,28 ff.

the war against the Turks and that the entire war might be another piece of papal treachery.[80] Luther was aware of the political alliances which often included Venice, Florence, France, the Turks, and the pope against Charles V and the empire.[81] And he reported that this conspiracy was paying for the services of the army of the Turks with 300,000 gold gulden per month.[82] The money which the papacy was collecting all over the world for the war against the Turks was actually being used to supply the Turks against the Christians.[83] And he said with indignation that such a monstrous treason as the alliance of the "most Christian king of France" and the "most holy pope of Rome" with the Moslems against the emperor had not been equalled in many centuries."[84] And in view of his own loyalty to the empire which had condemned him and the emperor, who had made every effort to destroy him, Luther's indignation seems understandable.

Luther had also had the opportunity to use the Turks against his enemies in Europe. This possibility was presented to him through the report of a German member of an imperial mission to Suleiman. This man, by the name of Schmaltz, told Luther that the Sultan had personally asked him about Luther and his age. When Schmaltz had told Suleiman that Luther was forty-eight years old the Sultan had said, "I wish he were even younger, he would find in me a gracious protector."[85] When Luther heard this report he crossed himself and said, "May God protect me from such a gracious protector."

His reaction was similar when he was approached by the landgrave of Hesse who wanted him to use his influence with the elector of Saxony against granting the emperor any aid for the war against the Turks, in view of the emperor's treatment of the

80 *Ibid.*, Briefe, 10,230 (December 29, 1542, Nr. 3852, Luther to Justus Jonas).

81 *Ibid.*, Briefe, 5,62 (May 6, 1529, Nr. 1416, Luther to Wenzeslaus Link); cf. P. Smith and C. M. Jacobs: *Luther's Correspondence*, 2 vol. (Philadelphia, 1913), Vol. II, p. 475.

82 Luther, *op. cit.*. Briefe, 10,526 (February 9, 1544, Nr. 3967, Luther to Joachim Mörlin); Briefe, 10,526 (February 9, 1544, Nr. 3967, Luther to Anton Lauterbach).

83 *Ibid.*, Briefe, 10,541 (March 8, 1544, Nr. 3974, Luther to Amsdorf).

84 *Ibid.*, Briefe, 10,553 (April 17, 1544, Nr. 3982, Luther to Justus Jonas).

85 *Ibid.*, Tischreden 2,508,17.

Evangelical ambassadors who had been sent to him.[86] Luther answered evasively, saying that the elector had not asked him for any advice and that he would advise him when the opportunity would present itself to the best of his ability and as his conscience would permit. And again Luther indicated that the priests rather than the emperor were responsible for this tyrannical treatment of the ambassadors.[87] Nine years later, when again asked for his advice with respect to the war against the Turks, he wrote to John Frederick, "Since in this great emergency not only Ferdinand and our enemies will have to suffer but also our fatherland and many good and honest people, I believe that your electoral grace should rightly and with a clear conscience help to comfort and aid this poor group (though not the tyrants). Thus the conscience will not have to sigh after the damage has been done and accuse itself and say, "why didn't you help protect the poor people when you were able to do so and let the unimportant matter of the strife among tyrants prevent you from helping?"[88]

It was Luther's confidence that history is at all times God's history which often enabled him to gain perspective with respect to a contemporary situation. It was his eschatology which led him to believe that rulers should at all times be guided by a clean conscience. In his "Warning to my Dear Germans" he wrote, "We Germans should remember what happened when we started to break the peace against St. John Hus and fought the Bohemians. Then, too, the pope sacrificed us under the butcher's knife so that we had to sacrifice our blood and our heads in order to satisfy his lust; fighting all the time against truth and justice."[89] From this somewhat detached point of view Luther considered Charles V an honest man and a peace-maker surrounded by enemies who were evil and wanted war rather than peace. This belief placed Luther in all questions of foreign policy squarely behind Charles. The anti-Evangelical stand of Charles Luther attributed to his

86 *Ibid.*, Briefe, 5,203 (December 16, 1529, Nr. 1507, Luther to Landgrave Philipp); cf. Smith, Jacobs, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 507-509.

87 *Ibid.*, Briefe, 5,203 ff.

88 *Ibid.*, Briefe, 8,232 (May 29, 1538, Nr. 3236, Luther to Elector John Frederick).

89 *Ibid.*, 30 (3),281.

advisers, and he tried his very best to explain it away. Luther used his personal influence to strengthen the emperor's hand against his enemies, often disregarding the immediate political advantages which an anti-imperial policy would have offered. Not many of the Lutheran princes followed his leadership. But perhaps Napoleon was not so far wrong when he said that Charles by embracing Lutheranism could have conquered Europe at the head of a united Germany.[90] The tragedy of Charles V's foreign policy was that those who might have politically agreed with him opposed him for religious reasons—and that those whose religious cause he defended stabbed him in the back for reasons of politics.

90 Armstrong, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 47.

Wilhelm Loehe

Gerhard Ottersberg

NEUENDETTELSAU is a quiet German village in Bavaria some twenty miles southwestward from Nuernberg. In 1837 it was the seat of a rural parish which included a neighboring village or two and contained perhaps a little more than a thousand souls. Difficult of access and lonely, it contained an undistinguished rural church and a small parsonage. It yielded an annual income of $250-$300 which was not increased during the next thirty-five years. The people were Franconian peasant stock, rather stolid and set in their ways. The place did not seem to present a particular challenge or offer especial opportunity; when the call was offered to the no longer youthful candidate, who served as vicar in a neighboring village, he agreed to consider it only if he should not have another position in view at the end of the vicariate. But candidates were numerous and vacancies few, and so the call was accepted and Wilhelm Loehe became pastor of Neuendettelsau in 1837.

He was then twenty-nine years old, having been born in 1808 at Fuerth, a small city a few miles on the other side of Nuernberg. Though his earliest years fell into a period of world war, events of the era of Napoleon do not seem to have impressed him deeply, for an autobiography covering the years of his youth[1] makes no mention of them. His family was fairly well-to-do; the father held various municipal offices; nor did the death of the father when Loehe was eight disturb material well-being. The mother was a woman of remarkable strength of character as well as of deep piety, who exercised a profound influence upon her son throughout her long life. The desire to enter the Christian ministry developed in Loehe in early youth and never wavered.

1 Deinzer, J., *Wilhelm Loehe's Leben*, 3 vols. (Nuernberg, 1874; Guetersloh, 1880, 1892). The autobiography is in 1, 1-41.

His secondary education was acquired in nearby Nuernberg and his university training chiefly at Erlangen, only a little farther away. Loehe's youth fell into the period of rationalism with its shallow spiritual attitude and confessional indifference. At Erlangen Loehe was influenced chiefly by Christian Krafft, a noted Reformed theologian, who had broken with rationalism and who contributed much to deepening and strengthening spirituality in Loehe. The latter, however, was not at all attracted to the Reformed Church, but developed a staunchly Lutheran confessional attitude at Erlangen. In accordance with German academic custom he planned to spend a year at Berlin but returned to Erlangen after one semester. Though he took work with Schleiermacher at Berlin, none of his teachers there seem to have influenced his thinking deeply. Their impact on his preaching, however, was much greater. During his stay he assiduously listened to sermons, often three or four on a Sunday, even though they might last up to two hours. Partly Schleiermacher, but especially Franz Theremin exerted a formative influence in this respect.[2]

Loehe completed his studies at Erlangen in 1830 and in the same year passed the required theological examinations with distinction, as he did the second examinations, which had to be taken five years later. It was not easy to obtain even a temporary position. During the next seven years he served as vicar in nine different parishes for periods varying from a few weeks to more than two years. His vicariate of longest duration was served at Kirchenlamitz in the extreme northeast of Bavaria. Although his deeply spiritual, evangelical preaching there won the adherence of the congregation as a whole, it offended rationalist elements, who protested to a rationalist consistory against subversive pietism and secured Loehe's dismissal, despite protests from his pastor and the rank and file of the congregation. He also served as vicar for a year in two different churches at Nuernberg; and again his preaching attracted wide attention, winning life-long followers, but also alienating rationalist elements and leading to protests to the consistory, which on this occasion were ineffective.

2 H. Kressel, *Wilhelm Loehe als Prediger* (Guetersloh, 1929), 24-32.

It was thus a young pastor of not inconsiderable experience and a clergyman whose profound Christian spirituality and staunch confessionalism had already involved him in controversy, who accepted his first permanent position, when he received the call to Neuendettelsau in 1837. Just before he took up his duties he was married to Helene Andreae, a young woman of eighteen whom he had confirmed near Nuernberg some years earlier and who was the daughter of a well-to-do merchant at Frankfurt. The marriage was ideally happy, but lasted only six years. Loehe's bereavement in 1843 left him a lonely widower for the remainder of his life. It also left him with four children, one of whom died within a year. The education of his children he took into his own hands up to the age of confirmation. Though his mother helped at times, his household had no mistress until his daughter had grown up, and in his later years when his daughter was seriously ill and absent for prolonged periods of convalescence, Loehe, himself in poor health, was often entirely alone.

Loehe hardly expected to spend his lifetime in Neuendettelsau when he accepted the call there in 1837. Indeed he vainly applied for city parishes four times during the first ten years of his ministry and resigned himself to his small and lonely rural pastorate only after the fourth failure. He also never held administrative office in the Bavarian state church, even though his credentials, issued after his examinations, carried a notation of fitness for official position. The reasons for this failure to secure transfer and promotion are not specifically stated by his biographers. If rationalist influences in high places had held him suspect of pietism in his youth, the character of his ministry at Neuendettelsau did nothing to disarm these suspicions, though he did not encounter the opposition in the congregation there that had caused trouble elsewhere. During the years when he was seeking transfer, the attitude may well have prevailed that he would cause trouble in city congregations where liberal and rationalist elements might resent his attitude.

After 1848 Loehe's attempts to transform the Bavarian state church into a confessional Lutheran church stood in the way

of advancement. That church as it was constituted after 1815 was under the headship of the king who was Catholic, and it embraced all Protestant congregations in Bavaria, Reformed as well as Lutheran. Both groups were represented in the church government, and while congregations of both confessions existed, there were also those of mixed membership. In Bavaria proper the Lutheran element predominated, but in the Bavarian Palatinate the church was Reformed. The Revolution of 1848 marked the beginning of efforts on the part of Loehe and a small circle of confessional Lutheran clergymen to bring about a separation within the state church along confessional lines.

During the course of the revolution not only did religious liberty and equality receive stress, but there were plans for union transcending state boundaries. Loehe was in harmony with these ideals, but the church which he envisioned was to be founded on adherence to the Lutheran confessions and was to practice discipline which would exclude the worldly as well as enforce confessional solidarity. Specifically he demanded abolition of the headship of the Catholic king over the Protestant church and separate organization of the Lutheran and the Reformed confessions. Within the separated churches clergymen were to pledge loyalty to their confessions at the time of ordination, while the confessionally lax among those already ordained were to be admonished and, if necessary, dismissed. The principle, Lutheran altars only for Lutheran communicants, was to be enforced. Pastors were to exclude from the sacrament members who obviously lacked faith, insisted upon rejecting the confessions, or lived in open sin, until they could be brought to repent.[3]

Strong resistance developed to this program and it was never possible to secure its adoption in its entirety. For a dozen years Loehe carried on the struggle. He secured chiefly the formal separation of the two confessions with the resulting establishment of Lutheran and Reformed churches. But it proved impossible to secure the adoption of strict confessional practice within the Lu-

3 Deinzer, II, 538-541.

theran state church. The elimination of rationalist elements from the church government and the appointment of Loehe's friend Harless as president of the state consistory resulted in a much more sympathetic attitude on the part of the authorities, but the resistance to the full program was too strong to make its adoption possible. In 1856 the consistory issued a series of directives looking toward the realization of Loehe's aims, but a storm of popular protest in the press and a flood of contrary petitions placed the consistory itself under attack and forced modification.

During these years of controversy Loehe was constantly face to face with the question of separation from the state church and establishment of an independent organization. He was in correspondence with north German pastors who had broken with the Prussian Union and set up a free church in that state. Their advice to him was to remain in the state church until driven out. Immediately before the appointment of Harless it seemed probable that this would happen. The consistory at one time asked Loehe and his adherents to consider whether they could conscientiously remain in the state church and in 1852 had his dismissal under consideration. While the reconstitution of the consistory ended this threat, the struggle went on. It was mixed altar fellowship in particular which burdened Loehe's conscience. Although the question did not arise in his own parish, which supported his position, his conscience objected to membership in a church which tolerated the practice. He never carried this objection to the point of separation, however, but contented himself with advising confessional Lutherans in congregations where mixed altar fellowship was practiced to commune at other altars than their own.

Toward 1860 a series of events once more made Loehe a center of controversy. He had in an exceptional case responded to the wish of a patient in his local institution for an anointing according to James 5:14. Unwisely this instance was given publicity together with a liturgical form which had been used.[4] Widespread

4 Correspondenzblatt, 1857, #12, *Der apostolische Krankenbesuch.*

criticism accused Loehe of Romanizing with a view toward re-establishing the extreme unction. As a result Loehe was called to account and the consistory forbade repetition of the practice. Not long afterward local disciplinary practice and voluntary private confession on the part of children enrolled in the institutional schools were called into question, but no disciplinary action was taken. In 1860 Loehe refused marriage to a member who had secured a divorce and had lived in flagrant adultery. It should be said that there was no provision for civil marriage in Germany at that time and that the man was legally entitled to marriage. Loehe's refusal to marry him was declared to be a violation of his official duty and he was suspended from office, but reinstated after the marriage had been performed by another pastor. At about the same time a publication in which Loehe rather uncritically had accepted improbable traditions in presenting the lives of medieval saints[5] again led to the suspicion of Romanizing tendencies. This incident, however, had no bearing on the suspension and after his reinstatement no further difficulties developed. After 1860 the period of acute controversy with his church was over.

Loehe had borne witness for his confessional convictions manfully. The results were not all that he wished them to be, but a good deal had been gained nevertheless. If confessional Lutheranism was not universally practiced within the state church, it had at least gained recognition of its right to exist and a great many evils had been eliminated or moderated. Loehe had made mistakes also. While the instances which had led to the suspicion of Romanizing trends resulted from his emphasis on sanctification in Christian living and were harmless in themselves, it had been unwise to give them publicity. A friendly biographer records the criticism that in his desire to establish confessional Lutheranism Loehe manifested an impatience which militated against success, a demand for immediate results in dealing with deeply-rooted practices which needed to be attacked, but which could be rooted out only through decades of persistent endeavor.[6]

5 Loehe, *Rosenmonate heiliger Frauen* (Stuttgart, 1860).
6 Th. Schaefer, *Wilhelm Loehe* (Guetersloh, 1909), 157-160.

In his ministry at Neuendettelsau, meanwhile, Loehe was exemplifying his ideals of Lutheran confessionalism through emphasis on scriptural preaching and intensive pastoral care. His sermons were far above the level of the usual rural parish and were attracting the attention of wider circles. Liturgical practices, providing a dignified, reverent setting for the preaching of the Word, were close to his heart. He was delving deeply into the treasures of the old church to resurrect liturgical riches. Stress was placed on the use of the sacraments, parish education, the care of the sick and on sanctification, particularly through private confession and brotherly discipline.

Preaching at Neuendettelsau made heavy demands upon the pastor. Services involving sermons were held regularly three times a week, on Sunday, Wednesday and Friday. On the great festival days there were two services and on the numerous communion Sundays additional confessional addresses. In addition a total of about twenty lesser festivals, such as the days of the apostles, were observed with services, although some of these would coincide with regular service days. Loehe also practically always spoke when ministerial acts took place. At baptisms brief informal addresses were the rule and this was partly true also of marriages, although special matrimonial sermons were not uncommon. Funerals always called for sermons. His biographers estimate that there were ordinarily seventy to eighty such occasions for special addresses during a year and that the total annual number of addresses and sermons averaged about two hundred. In the later years Loehe had a vicar; but the burden was not diminished, because the deaconesses had their own church by that time, and he served as its pastor to the end of his life.

For the Sunday sermons Loehe preferred the regular pericopes, though he substituted free texts quite often on festival days or when an occasion arose to deal with a specific need. In the weekday services he liked to preach series of sermons on books of the Bible, using nearly all of them in the course of his ministry. He chose his texts for special occasions with great care, endeavoring to select a passage suitable for the particular burial or other minis-

terial act. In his earlier years he meticulously wrote his sermons in full detail, even though he did not memorize them word for word even then. Later he prepared detailed outlines or sketches. If occasionally he could not do this and had to content himself with meditation on the text, he preached with a power and fluency, even if he had had only a few minutes for preparation, which scarcely permitted hearers who knew him intimately to detect a difference.[7]

In his younger years Loehe studied published sermons closely, reading those of most eminent Lutheran preachers, with especial emphasis on Luther, and giving attention also to noted preachers of the old church, such as Savonarola and Chrysostom. In later life he substituted extensive reading in periodicals, theological works in all branches, literature, history. What he read became his own and was reflected in his preaching. His sermons, however, remained essentially scriptural. His exegetical work had its limitations, lacking a thoroughly scientific grammatical and historical approach,[8] but he endeavored to present to his hearers the fullness of revealed divine thought. In texts which he used frequently he found new facets, and his hearers were rarely conscious of repetition when he preached on the pericopes year after year. From central thoughts he proceeded to the treatment of peripheral ideas, and, always fresh and vital, found realistic applications.

Loehe was a master of the German language. The solid inner worth of his preaching was presented in a style which gripped the hearer; his discourse flowed smoothly, without ornate rhetorical trickery, but in a calm, majestic presentation which was concrete, chaste, and clear. He used a wealth of illustrative material, but it was rarely narrative, usually descriptive, suited to the mentality of his audience, often drawn from nature or from the divine Word itself. He had a powerful voice; when he preached before large audiences in great city churches he was easily understood, but he adapted its volume to the village church where he preached regularly. The effectiveness of his delivery was achieved through the modulation of the voice. He was capable of carrying away his hear-

7 Deinzer, II, 122.
8 Kressel, 109-114.

ers into rapt devotion, especially on festival days when adoration was the keynote of the preaching, and to touch the emotions, though he never appealed to shallow sentimentalism. Behind the delivery the hearer was always conscious of the personality, of the intense, passionate sincerity of the preacher.

It took an audience to carry Loehe away to the heights. Though carefully prepared in the study, the sermon took its final shape in the pulpit; its expression was determined by the rapport between hearer and preacher. For this reason a just appreciation of Loehe's sermons must take into account those recorded by rapt hearers. Several volumes of his sermons have been published, and there have been critics who did not rate them highly. But the published sermons are at best the material that came to life during delivery. Many of them also were reworked extensively to serve the general needs of a wider public and so lost the vitality of their local setting. Loehe's preaching reached his congregation, not deliberately pitched on a low level suited to an audience which was intellectually backward; it was never over the heads of the hearers, but bent upon drawing them up to a grasp of divine truth.

The effectiveness of the preaching may be measured by the attendance which usually filled the church to overflowing, though the weekday services, as is understandable in a rural congregation, were less well attended than those on Sundays. Loehe also drew hearers from a wide rural area, who seem to have come long distances in all seasons, even though they frequently had to stand through the services after traveling on foot for hours. There were also visitors from the cities some distance away especially on festival days. Theological students from Erlangen seem to have considered it a part of their training to hear Loehe from time to time. A few faithful followers from nearby cities settled down in Neuendettelsau to become regular hearers.[9]

Liturgy had been neglected during the heyday of rationalism; Loehe made it part of his life work to restore and enrich it. His studies in the field began with the older Lutheran orders of service

9 Kressel, 68-72.

and liturgical handbooks; he found and compared some 200 of these. Reaching back into the medieval and ancient church, he became particularly interested in the liturgies of the old eastern churches. The liturgical studies had been begun in 1843 at the time of his bereavement, and he then found consolation in delving into them deeply. His *Agende* is the product of these studies, designed particularly for the missions in America. It was a handbook, appearing in two editions during his lifetime, which broke ground for a resurgence of interest in liturgics in the Lutheran Church. Objections and criticism were not lacking; the complaint of Romanizing was first raised against him after the appearance of the *Agende*. Liturgical restoration was part of his program for the reform of the Bavarian church and met bitter resistance. In Neuendettelsau Loehe, however, was able to introduce a full liturgy with congregational participation with but little complaint, because he proceeded gradually and took care to prepare the congregation step by step. In the deaconess institution he was able not only to develop liturgical practices, but also to arouse an interest in paraments and to train members skilled at providing them.

Loehe took a great interest in religious education even in the parishes which he served only briefly in his youth. Visiting the schools, helping the teachers to improve instruction, giving religious instruction, were regular activities. At Neuendettelsau instruction preparatory to confirmation was his personal task. Luther's small catechism was in his eyes one of the greatest of the treasures of the Lutheran Church. His objectives in teaching it were first textual explanation so that the literal meaning might be perfectly clear, and second introduction to doctrinal content. He placed particular stress upon the fundamental nature of the sacraments and taught that in Communion the high point of Christian life is reached, and sought with all the impact of a hallowed personality to recommend its constant, reverent use.

He published several booklets for confirmands, particularly a communion book which was widely used. Although he originally had little interest in societies, he established separate young people's societies for boys and girls to deal with the post-confirmation

problem. His *Christenlehren* on Sundays were for the entire congregation and he addressed questions impartially to children, youths, and adults. He also published an elaborate manual for instruction for the American missions.[10] It was designed for conditions among unchurched people where formal instruction was lacking and, following Luther's model, gave directions to parents to instruct their own children. Both the question and answer sections and the collection of biblical passages which it contained became models for later American editions.

Perhaps the single most outstanding feature of Loehe's pastoral practice was his emphasis on the use of private confession. When he began his work at Neuendettelsau he found only the common public confession in use. He did not reject or even belittle this practice. But he believed that living Christians would at times feel the need for a personal absolution and that the opportunity should be given. For several years Loehe confined himself to the use of common confession, but during this time he continued to stress the blessing of private confession in instruction and in his addresses. When he then announced his readiness to hear individuals, they came. From that time onward the private confession was in common but by no means exclusive use. He patiently strove to lead his parishioners away from set forms and to speak from the heart, and confessed that his most heartening experiences occurred during the confessionals. His consecrated personality was no doubt a major factor in this development. The deaconesses in the later years also adopted the practice; and since communion was given every third Sunday, the physical strain of hearing confessions became heavy after he had begun to age, but he continued the practice to the end.[11]

Loehe's ideal of discipline would have eliminated from membership in the church those who openly lacked faith or rejected the confessions, and those whose open and unrepentant sin was a public scandal. In a state church this ideal could not be carried out. In Neuendettelsau he did insist on discipline in regard to

10 Loehe, *Haus-Schul-und Kirchenbuch*, three parts (Guetersloh, 1845), 1859.
11 Deinzer, II, 163.

admission to the altar. His deacons were present when announcements were made and, where cause existed, either Loehe himself or the deacons asked the individual to step aside. He was then privately admonished and on confession admitted. If he was unrepentant, he was denied admission. To be readmitted repentance had to be manifested to the pastor and the deacons. This order was questioned by the church authorities but not forbidden. Loehe also placed great stress on brotherly discipline, encouraging individuals to admonish each other privately whenever sin occurred. There is little evidence that this was common in the congregation, but among the deaconesses as well as in the mission school, it was in practice.

If the care of the sick is an accepted duty of clergymen, Loehe may well be studied as a model. He met no difficulties in this direction because it was custom at Neuendettelsau to call in the pastor in all cases of illness. Since medical care was then neglected, he sometimes gave medical advice in his younger years; but he soon abandoned this, warned fellow clergymen against it, and advised his parishioners to obtain the services of physicians. He endeavored to determine the psychological effects of illness upon the specific patient and to utilize his findings for spiritual guidance. His hallowed personality poured out in fervent prayer made lifelong impressions upon the young students and assistants who sometimes accompanied him. At deathbeds he rose to the heights, and there too he frequently found that his ministry had not been in vain. If parishioners commonly disappointed him in falling short of the level of sanctification which he advocated so earnestly, in the face of death he often found the faith and the desire for forgiveness which are the fruits of faithful preaching of the Word.

In Loehe's ministry the Word of God was central, its proclamation the paramount duty of the pastor in preaching, teaching, and in pastoral care. Its result would be a saving faith, and the faith would manifest itself in growing sanctification. A sanctified Christian life would involve discipline, communion, and sacrifice. Discipline, besides eliminating those who lacked faith, would

stimulate repentance and preserve faith. Communion would draw Christians together for worship and common effort. Sacrifice meant serving the cause of God's kingdom in selfless love. In the apostolic church, particularly in the diaconate of the Book of Acts he found the exemplary realization of these details. The practical outgrowth of these convictions was the organization of the deaconess institutions, in the direction of which Loehe's organizational talents were to find the outlet denied them in the state church.

In 1853 Loehe published a project in which he pointed out the desirability of training women for the care of the sick. Institutions might be established in which such training could be given to daughters of middle class families. They need not confine their educational training to this purpose alone, but could also provide general education for girls. The institutions should center around hospitals, though small rural hospitals were preferable to large urban institutions, so that practical training could be given. While graduates might serve as nurses in hospitals, they might also serve individually in their homes and congregations. As Loehe developed these ideas he thought not of a large central institution, but of numerous smaller ones and he advocated the organization of local societies throughout Bavaria to organize and support numerous small centers. To stimulate wide interest and general participation in eleemosynary work was the original aim.[12]

The appeal was, however, to be limited to Lutheran circles. Loehe was familiar with the work of Wichern and Fliedner, but in contrast to their Protestant orientation desired to establish his organization upon a confessional basis. Possibly as a result of this the original ideas were radically altered in practice. A society was formed in 1854 and a number of local branches came into existence, but they did not flourish. The number of local societies was never larger than nine and it tended to decrease rather than to grow. There was a measure of local activity under their auspices, but it never became significant.

The result was that Loehe's efforts became concentrated at

12 Deinzer, III, 145-154.

Neuendettelsau. There the deaconess motherhouse was built in 1854, despite grave financial difficulties. It contained a hospital, the various schools for the women and girls and the beginnings of a school for feeble-minded children. Young girls were admitted so that the school serving them might serve as a training school for young women preparing to teach. Soon there were three distinct schools, the elementary, the preparatory, and the deaconess school. Loehe himself took charge of instruction as well as of general management, while the deaconesses, again for training purposes, took charge of the details of administration. A physician gave medical instruction. The deaconesses were organized into the order of the house of Stephen, adopted their distinctive garb, and soon began their own publication.

Loehe gave his major attention to this undertaking for the remainder of his life. A comparatively small circle of supporters contributed generously and the complex of institutions soon expanded. Hospitals for men and women, a home for the feeble-minded, an industrial school, a home for abandoned girls, a chapel, and a home for delinquent women arose one after the other.[13] Deaconesses were sent into service in the various German states wherever demand for them arose; only gradually did sufficient demand develop in Bavaria to lead to concentration of the work there. The sisters caught the spirit of the founder and devoted themselves to carrying out his ideals. Organized as a separate congregation, through Loehe's lifetime they remained in his charge and drew from him the inspiration to devote themselves to selfless service. The institutions today remain a noble monument to the founder.

The organization of the work of the deaconesses absorbed Loehe's energies in his last two decades, but this branch of inner missions was undertaken only after years of effort had been devoted to home missions in America. Since 1841 he had been active in training missionaries to gather unchurched Lutherans and to preserve confessional consciousness among German immigrants in the new world. He had been instrumental in organizing two

13 Schaefer, 205-206.

Lutheran synods in America, had built up an organization devoted to this work, and established a school for training emergency pastors. Nor was this work abandoned when Loehe turned his personal attention to the needs of the home church. The organization and the school continued to function under leaders who worked in close harmony with the founder.

In 1841 while visiting at Erlangen Loehe saw an appeal for aid for America issued on behalf of F. Wynecken who was then in Germany.[14] Wynecken called attention to the missionary task arising from heavy immigration particularly in the midwestern area. Loehe at once issued a stirring appeal of his own through a paper edited by his friend and later collaborator Wucherer. He pictured the spiritual desolation of unchurched immigrants, the danger of drifting into sectarian churches or even into Catholicism, and stressed the need for missionaries. The immediate result was that contributions began to come in. Loehe and Wucherer had already decided to turn these funds over to the Dresden missionary society, when that group turned a youth, who had approached it for training, back to his native Bavaria. Loehe and Wucherer saw a divine mandate in this incident to act independently.

Loehe brought the young man, Adam Ernst, to Neuendettelsau where he was soon joined by a companion, G. Burger. Both were skilled craftsmen, and Loehe's plan was that they might support themselves through practicing their trades until they could find positions as teachers. He took personal charge of their instruction, stressing elementary school subjects and Christian doctrine and also teaching them English. In the next year they were sent to America with instructions conforming to Loehe's plans which, however, also provided that they might apply to a Lutheran synod for examination and ordination if they should locate in an entirely unchurched area. They were not to enter the Christian ministry independently, but were to comply with such demands for additional training as an American church might make.[15]

14 Partly reprinted in G. J. Fritschel, *Geschichte der lutherischen Kirche in Amerika*, 2 vols. (Guetersloh, 1896, 1897), II, 130-138.

15 Instruction in Deinzer, III, 7-10.

Ernst and Burger made contact with the Ohio Synod soon after their arrival and traveled to Columbus, where Ernst opened a school, while Burger entered Capital Seminary. Burger was ready to enter the ministry after a year and Ernst also was ordained in 1843. The Ohio Synod appealed to Loehe to send more men with the same preparatory training. Wynecken in the meantime in Germany was presenting his appeal in person in various areas, including Bavaria. These renewed appeals caused Loehe to continue his endeavors, for a time in collaboration with the Ohio Synod. In response to requests, theological books were supplied for the library of Capital Seminary and a project was formed to send a German theologian to teach there; youths who wished to serve might then be sent directly to the seminary. The project could not be carried out and so Loehe continued to train young men, *Nothhelfer,* as he called them. Most of them joined the Ohio Synod, but some took membership in the Michigan Synod which was just coming into existence; a few seem also to have entered the Buffalo Synod.

Wynecken's appeal had stirred much response in Germany and as a result Loehe's activities soon found support in other areas than Bavaria. Young men from various states came for training; fully trained theological candidates volunteered for service in America. Organizations were formed in various areas to raise funds to make it possible to send the volunteers. Perhaps the best organized support came from Hannover under Petri's leadership, while circles in Saxony and in Mecklenburg also were active. Loehe, who acted as general director of all this activity, also founded a paper which popularized the cause and the proceeds of which were devoted to the work.[16]

The connection with the Ohio Synod was not to last long. Loehe always strongly stressed the German language and saw it as the duty of the church to preserve it among the immigrants. In the Ohio Synod a group sought to stress English. Connected

16 *Kirchliche Mittheilungen aus und ueber Nordamerika* (Noerdlingen, 1843). This publication contains invaluable source material.

with this was suspicion of confessional indifference among the English group. When in 1845 the controversy in the synod left the English group in control, the pastors whom Loehe had sent left the synod. Confessional struggles also divided the Michigan Synod, and there too Loehe's students withdrew. With the dissolution of these synodical ties, formation of a separate organization seemed indicated. With help from Loehe a seminary was established at Fort Wayne. It was quartered in a rented building, but funds from Germany made possible the purchase of land which might later serve as campus and the rent from which was available for expenses. Loehe also assumed responsibility for salaries and furnished theological books. The students then in preparation in Germany entered the new American seminary, and a preparatory institution was opened at Nuernberg which was to serve as feeder and soon came to be in charge of F. Bauer.

Loehe had already asked his emissaries in America to establish contacts with the Saxon congregations near St. Louis which had freed themselves from the leadership of Stephen and stood for confessional Lutheranism. After the separation correspondence was begun and in 1846 several of his emissaries traveled to St. Louis. The result was a draft constitution which was approved with a few changes later in the year at a conference in Fort Wayne with Walther and Loeber representing the Saxons. Its final adoption in 1847 completed the organization of the Missouri Synod. Loehe did not approve the constitution in its entirety, objecting to Walther's doctrine of the ministry, but did not press his objections. He complied with the wish of the new synod that the seminary at Fort Wayne be turned over to it as well as with the further request to continue to support it with funds and students.

Foreign missions among the American Indians before long also were included in Loehe's American activities. His project contemplated the establishment of a Lutheran colony in a suitable region. A Christian congregation furnishing an example of sanctified Christian living was to be the base for the proclamation of the Gospel by an energetic and devoted missionary. A group of emigrants, largely from Loehe's own parish, motivated not by

material hopes but by missionary zeal, in 1845 established Frankenmut in Saginaw County, Michigan. Its constitution was drawn up by Loehe and embodied the principles of his own ministry. The colony passed through a period of hardship, but was soon in flourishing condition. Candidate A. Craemer became pastor and possessed the capacity to exercise the leadership which the colony needed and also the zeal to make contacts with the Indians and establish a school for Indian children. Before long he was able to baptize the first converts. Later the Dresden Society sent missionary Baierlein under whom a flourishing mission arose at Bethania. The Missouri Synod took over the mission and eventually maintained three stations. Baierlein's removal to India, competition from sectarian missions, and Indian removal eventually wrecked the undertaking; in the early sixties it died out.[17]

When the Iowa Synod was established, another beginning in Indian work was made. After vain attempts to gain a foothold in Canada and on Lake Superior, missionary J. Schmidt established contacts with the Crows in remote Montana. With men and means furnished from Bavaria the small synod sought to follow up this contact, but its attempt to establish a station on the Powder River failed when Sioux murdered Missionary Braeuninger in 1860. A station at Deer Creek in Wyoming worked with the Cheyenne, but results were meager and the Indian disturbances following the Civil War forced its abandonment. This mission too had contemplated colonization, but means had never permitted a large scale attempt.[18]

Colonization had originally been undertaken as an adjunct to missionary plans, but Loehe went on to contemplate wider uses. Since home missions in America had difficulty in following up immigrants scattered over wide areas, it might be desirable to direct emigration into selected regions and to build up solid settlements

17 Deinzer, III, 38-57. Cf. footnote 19.

18 Two unpublished dissertations deal with this mission in detail. E. G. Fritschel, "A History of the Indian Mission of the Iowa Synod" (Wartburg Seminary, B.D.); and the writer's "A History of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Iowa and Other States" (University of Nebraska, Ph.D.), ch. IX.

of confessional Lutherans. In 1847 Frankentrost was established not far from Frankenmut to create such a center in Michigan, because relatives and friends of the Frankenmut settlers were planning emigration. When this colony also succeeded, Loehe began to gather a fund for land purchases; the land was to be sold to settlers and the proceeds reinvested in further purchases. A third successful colony, Frankenlust was established in 1848. Social purposes predominated in the planning of the fourth colony, Frankenhilf. Poverty-stricken youths in Bavaria were usually unable to obtain marriage licenses and formed illegitimate unions. They and their children had little chance ever to rise above the level of a stigmatized proletariat. This colony was to afford them an opportunity to make a new start under happier auspices.[19]

The colonies and their pastors joined the Missouri Synod, and Loehe's cooperation with that body continued for a number of years. Its rapid growth in large measure was due to his aid. Nuernberg sent students to Fort Wayne, which sent them into the ministry. Financial support went to both Fort Wayne and the Indian missions. In 1849 a society was founded which took charge of the missions as well as the colonies.[20] Loehe also contemplated the establishment of another institution for the purpose of training teachers for parochial schools. In 1852 he established a *Pilgerhaus* at Saginaw, which was to serve simultaneously as hospice for newly arrived immigrants, as hospital for the ill among them, and as the teachers' seminary.

At this point doctrinal dissension caused the Missouri Synod to break with Loehe. In several books which Loehe had published[21] he had taken positions on the church and the ministry which differed from the views which Walther held. The differ-

19 An unpublished dissertation, H. R. Greenholt, "A Study of Wilhelm Loehe, His Colonies and the Lutheran Indian Missions in the Saginaw Valley of Michigan" (Chicago, Ph.D.) is a thorough treatment of the colonies.

20 *Gesellschaft füer innere Mission im Sinne der lutherischen Kirche.* In 1934 the society published *Das missionarische Erbe Wilhelm Loehes* which describes the origin.

21 Loehe, *Drei Buecher von der Kirche* (Guetersloh, 1845); *Aphorismen ueber die neutestamentlichen Aemter* (Nuernberg, 1849); *Kirche und Amt. Neue Aphorismen* (Erlangen, 1851). See also *Der evangelische Geistliche,* 2 vols. (Guetersloh, 1872 and 1876), first published in periodicals in 1847-1848.

ences had been clear from the beginning of the relationship. Loehe held that they need not disturb confessional Lutheran unity, but Walther disagreed. In order to arrive at agreement the synod invited Loehe to visit America, but Loehe, then deeply involved in his struggle with the state church, could not come. Walther and Wynecken went to Germany in 1851, reached no agreement, but still hoped that Loehe might change his position. When this did not happen, a break resulted. It was perhaps the saddest of Loehe's many afflictions that the clergymen whom he had sent to America with but two exceptions and even the laity in the colonies, not only accepted Walther's views, but thereafter regarded their spiritual father as a heretic, fallen from grace.

The two dissidents, G. Grossmann at the Teachers' Seminary and J. Deindoerfer at Frankenhilf, were subjected to heavy pressure, and after Missouri had requested the removal of the institution, found a new field in Iowa. The school was temporarily located at Dubuque and soon became a theological seminary. The institution at Nuernberg was removed to Neuendettelsau and under Bauer's direction trained pastors who were sent to Iowa and students for the seminary. A colony was projected at St. Sebald in Clayton County, but colonization days were over. In 1854 the Iowa Synod was established there. Through long years of bitter controversy with Missouri it upheld the position that confessional Lutheranism does not require absolute unity in every detail of doctrine, but leaves room for open questions. In its practice it stressed the ideals of Loehe's ministry. It stressed parochial schools and staunchly stood for closed altars. In regard to discipline in its early days it maintained a probationary period before admitting members, and, unwisely, zealous pastors often split growing congregations to eliminate the ungodly. It also sought to maintain private confession, though with little result, and gave much stress to liturgy, not without meeting opposition among the laity.[22]

Loehe himself had become engrossed in his deaconess insti-

22 The standard history is J. Deindoerfer, *Geschichte der Evang-Luth. Synode von Iowa und andern Staaten* (Chicago, 1897).

tutions, but after the mission institute was located at Neuendettelsau, it was possible to keep in closer touch with America and he had the satisfaction of seeing the new synod grow and expand over the midwest. Long before his death early in 1872 the synod was soundly established. Through it, particularly in the period when it cooperated with the General Council, his influence continued to be felt in America. It may be added that after Loehe's death and after the Iowa Synod had become independent of his support, the mission institute at Neuendettelsau gave aid to the founding of Lutheran churches in Australia and Brazil and opened a mission field on the island of New Guinea which is still flourishing and where God may again open doors for emissaries in happier days.

Confessional Lutheranism was one of Loehe's great guiding principles. It meant to him staunch adherence to the doctrines of the Reformation, but not a rigid assumption that all doctrinal development had come to an end in the sixteenth century. On the contrary, it was the duty of the church to delve into the Word in order to attain a growing understanding of its peripheral teaching. Sanctification, the ceaseless struggle for perfection in selfless love, was his other great foundation stone. United in the faith that is the basis of justification, Christians must struggle against godlessness and form a communion devoted to worship and service. These were the guide lines which he followed in his long ministry, in his numerous writings, in his struggles with the state church, in his missionary endeavors in America.

That The Man Of God May Be Adequate

HARRY F. BAUGHMAN[1]

THE seminary exists for the church, even for the congregation—not the church for the seminary. All that the seminary does it does for the life of the church. Its work of training must be regarded as a means to an end. It is an arm of the church, a member of the Body of Christ. To minister to the life of the church, to strengthen and establish it requires a clear perception of purpose. And, the pastoral habit asserting itself, I turn to Scripture and find that purpose nowhere better declared than in St. Paul's letter to Timothy, "That the man of God may be . . . completely furnished unto every good work." In Goodspeed's translation it is, "That the man of God may be adequate, equipped for every good work." The seminary has no other reason for existence than this. Its primary business is to send into the life stream of the church, and so into the total life of the world men whose character, convictions, bearing and very presence shall proclaim whose they are, and whom they serve, and shall constrain the people among whom they move to say of them, as the Shunamite woman said of Elisha, "I perceive that this is a holy man of God." That is foremost. And this product of the seminary training, God's man, must be "adequate." He must be "completely furnished" to take his place in the exacting, critical life of this present world and relate it to a divine, eternal order, to bring the power of God as *reality* to bear redemptively upon life for time and eternity.

With this ideal then kept clearly in view, I propose that our thinking focus upon two relevant issues.

1 Inaugural address, at Gettysburg Theological Seminary, October 4, 1951.

THE ULTIMATE GOAL OF SEMINARY TRAINING TODAY

Students and professors who worship regularly in this Church of the Abiding Presence may see in one of its windows—if the eyes of the spirit are kept open to it—an arresting, imagination-stirring declaration of the ultimate purpose of all seminary training, that for which the man of God is to be adequate. Out of that ancient drama, Elijah's conflict with the priests of Baal, epitome of the everlasting conflict with the forces of darkness, comes this word of his prayer, "That this people may know that thou art God."

Much time has passed and many changes have come since that day when Jahwe, the champion of Elijah's people, was called upon to demonstrate by a sudden, supernatural intervention that "among the gods there is none like unto thee." But the fundamental issue involved there remains. No external changes, no increasing complexity of the life of society, no scientific advances, have nullified the perception of the prophet's prayer. They have rather served to magnify the imperative declared. This is the point at which the issue is joined today, and which sets the standard and goal of seminary training, "that this people may know that thou art God."

Theological training must face the issues confronting the church in its own stage of history. It is significant that two of the early presidents-elect of this Seminary, the second and the fourth, gave special prominence in their inaugurals to the principle of progress. As early as 1865, Dr. J. A. Brown made one of the divisions of his address on "The Theology for the Times," this: A Theology that is Comprehensive and Progressive. And even as he affirmed his loyalty to the historic pronouncements of the church, he plead for a theology that is "aggressive as well as defensive," a theology that is not content with merely defending old citadels, but which invades "the territories of ignorance, darkness and superstition."

Almost a score of years later Dr. Milton Valentine in his address, "Some Present Day Demands in Theological Training,"

made his second point the assertion that "Theological training must recognize the principle of development." And with his clear, incisive analysis he urged that with loyalty to the confessions of the church, her theologians be alert to the "light, that is continually breaking forth on the confession from God's word, enforcing it, as well as illuminating it. "And" he added, "especially the applications of that truth must be modified by the conditions of each succeeding generation and the ever changing states of society."

These Christian leaders thus spoke for a theology that faces and meets the needs of its own day. We accept the principle written into the tradition of the Seminary by these illustrious fathers, who themselves would be the first to recognize that the area of need has shifted. The battle rages upon a different front today from that indicated in their scholarly treatises. It would be decidedly irrelevant to attack or defend the citadels then involved. A little over "four score and seven years ago" here on the field of Gettysburg those first July days witnessed a succession of thrusts, assaults and bitter conflicts upon various important points and commanding eminences along the line. But finally on the third day the whole battle concentrated in one massive decisive attack, focusing upon so specific an objective as a copse of trees. So has the warfare of the Christian come to a central and crucial point.

For the church at this moment of history the vital issue is precisely that of Elijah's prayer on Mt. Carmel, not of course with the same connotations but with the same fundamental reality. It is "that the people may know that thou art God." Other issues have receded in importance. Some have been resolved by the patient processes of faith and understanding. This has emerged to the focal point. The developing life of society, the philosophies of men and nations, their assumptions, reliances and behavior have forced it into the position of decisive significance. The question that is critical today is whether God shall be recognized at all in the actual life of mankind. The vital issue is just this, shall life be lived upon the assumption of the humanist or in relation to, and by the power of God. Here for us the battle is joined. Of supreme concern for the world as well as for the church is the basic problem of the defi-

nition and acceptance of an ethic that has its roots in the Christian concept of God.

The evidences of this are patent. On one level of the life of society they are to be seen in the substitution of expediency for integrity as a role of conduct, in the appeal to common practice as a norm rather than to essential truth, in short, in the general discarding of moral sanctions once unquestioned. Upon another level they are to be seen in the amoral assumptions and practices of major social units. In the closely related areas, for example, of the individual's relation to the state, and of international practice, mores have displaced absolute right as the final court of appeal. Authority is determined not by essential truth, justice or honor, but by the will or the necessity of the power that exercises it at the moment. Judgment upon any vital choice or deed encounters finally the barrier beyond which society is not yet able to go—the necessity of the state to survive.

This disappearance of absolutes, one of the pronounced characteristics of contemporary life, is the critical issue for religion today. Society has apparently moved out into the ripening harvest period of the humanist thesis, "the chief end of man is the quest for the good life, and man has within himself all the powers requisite for its achievement." What the prophet Jeremiah called "the ethic of Jahweh" has little recognition or acceptance as an undergirding authority. Looking at a nation "in extremis" the prophet saw no lack of the name of God or of the ceremonial of His worship, or of legislation designed to declare the supremacy of God and the code that was put forth in His name. What he saw, and it smote him until he cried out with the pain of it, was that the "ethic of God" was not a part of the rule of life. "Two evils have my people committed, Me they have forsaken, the Fountain of living water, And have hewn out for themselves cisterns, Broken cisterns that can hold no water." Vital relationships, human behavior, national policy did not have back of them and beneath them an ultimate sanction. There was no living source. "Me they know not saith Jahweh."

The moral analyst today must be aware of a similar condition.

When the Chief Justice of the U. S. Supreme Court, echoing the opinion of a distinguished predecessor, says "there are no absolutes" he is saying that which cannot be disputed. He speaks the truth from the strictly legal point of view, from the intellectual and humanistic point of view. There are no absolutes, and one is terrified to contemplate all the implications of it—there are no absolutes except the people know God. Honesty is a quality susceptible of varying definitions as time, customs, or necessity vary. It is an absolute only if there is an ultimate truth that changes not and that ultimate truth is acknowledged. In both the Hebrew and the Christian religion *this is* the basis of moral conduct. "Be ye merciful as your Father in heaven is merciful," "Be ye holy in all manner of conversation because it is written be ye holy even as I am holy." The authority for any quality of character or behavior rests back finally upon the character of God. There are no absolutes, it is perfectly true. Religion need not be shocked by the affirmation. There are absolutes only if there is an Absolute. And this is not a matter of human agreement, or logical demonstration but of inner acceptance. Even as long ago as the sixth century B.C., a man of God saw that. "Behold the days come saith the Lord when I shall write my law upon their hearts, upon their inward parts shall I write it . . . and no man shall say know ye the Lord for every man shall know me even from the least unto the greatest, for I will forgive their iniquity." From a society that was failing because, although the name, the worship and the code of God had been formally established, the *ethic* of God was not accepted, the prophet turned to a day when life would be true because the knowledge of God was in the inner life of man.

That is the day of Christianity. And the warfare with all the forces of ignorance, superstition and evil that would defeat this inner and true knowledge of God is the real battle of the church today.

THE IMMEDIATE TASK OF THE SEMINARY

1. For this warfare the man of God must be "adequate, completely furnished unto every good work." In the light of this ob-

jective then, I conceive the task of the seminary as being, for one thing, *to interpret, nourish, and heighten the sense of call.* This is the most important task of theological training, without which all other accomplishments are empty and vain. I speak of the call here not in the sense of ecclesiastical polity. That is an inviting subject. It may however be safely committed to the informed mind and faithful spirit of the church. My thought now has to do with the inner life of the man of God, his whole motivation and attitude. There must be developed within him a burning awareness that he is God's man, that wherever he goes, God is represented. God has laid hold upon him and separated him for a holy task. He has stood in the presence of the bush that burns and is not consumed, and his eyes forever reflect the light of it. He has knelt before an altar, the place of revelation and said "here am I Lord, send me," and has meant it.

The strength of a well trained ministry may also be its weakness. In our zeal for a thorough training, we may lose zeal itself. And the seminary must be on guard constantly lest first things slip back into second or even last place and the church lose the dynamic that ought to characterize the messengers of the evangel. It is possible for our schools of theology to be wholly intent upon scholarly achievements, academic rank, efficient techniques—all of which are important, necessary, and not to be discounted—and yet to miss the one thing needful, the warmth and glow of fellowship with Him who is our life. The complaint of the Spirit to the Church at Ephesus was that it had not "maintained the glow." That strong, potentially great congregation had lost its enthusiasm. The fire of its early zeal, the warmth of its first conversion had gone out of it. "Thou didst leave thy first love." The seminary must be alive to that perennial peril of age and establishment. The peril is that the secularism which is so withering to the life of the spirit become dominant in the outlook of the church and her ministry, so that they regard the office with the same calculating objectivity that is the rule in the secular world. To maintain the spiritual glow, the man of God must be so possessed by the Word of the

Lord that it is "like a fire which burns within and cannot be kept under."

If those who go out from our Seminary are to be men of God through whom this people know God they must find here that which kindles an evangelical fervor, and fans the flame of it, the spirit that says, "I could wish that I myself were anathema for my brethren's sake." The holy, awe-ful task of the ministry cannot be accomplished in this hard, unspiritual world except by those in whom the world sees a correspondence between the zeal with which they sing "I'll go where you want me to go dear Lord" and the actual set of their faces and the direction of their lives. They must be those who say without cant, "I fill up that which is left of the suffering of Christ for the sake of His body, the Church." The law of the cross must be upon their lives, the call of the cross within their hearts. Their prayer must be at all times that of Richard Baxter, "this is the peal that conscience doth ring in my ears, O Lord do that on our own souls that thou wouldst use us to do on the souls of others."

To the accomplishment of this end all the resources of the seminary must be directed, and all her energies poured out. The most brilliant scholarship, the most highly developed arts and skills will not atone for the emptiness of life without dedication, of occupation without vocation. The achievement of this sense of call involves the whole spirit and attitude of student body, faculty, administration and the church as well. It is involved with the worship life of the individual and of the group. It is very pointedly dependent upon our attitude toward the Word of God and our use of it. It is vitally bound up with the spirit of consecration that pervades the whole life of the community and which must be constantly renewed and fed through the means of grace.

The maintaining of this holy ideal through every means ought to be the first concern of all theological training. It is my own concept of the most important duty confronting the bearer of administrative office in the church. And should this standard droop and the seminary become lax at this vital point let the petition be made

for grace to offer the prayer of Robert Louis Stevenson, "Lord, Thy most pointed pleasure take, and stab my spirit wide awake."

2. In the light of the declared objective, "that the man of God may be adequate" I conceive, furthermore, the task of this Seminary as being:

To impart to men a theology that is soundly and faithfully Lutheran. This is by no means the advocacy of an exclusive, separatist attitude or policy. The tradition of this Seminary has ever been in the direction of fellowship and cooperation with those who bear clear witness to the Sonship and Saviourhood of Jesus Christ. Its contributions to the ecumenical movement have been significant. On every level of church life this has been true. And it may be assumed that there will be no diminution of the readiness and zeal to share in the witness and the common tasks of Christendom.

But the exercise of this spirit of fellowship does not require the abandonment or neglect of convictions. Until the day when we see no longer "through a glass darkly but face to face," we may expect to find human minds differing upon many issues of doctrine, practice and worship. The unity of the spirit can be maintained in the bond of peace without surrendering fundamental convictions. We do not necessarily hasten the day of our Savior's prayer "that they may be one," by ignoring or temporarily shelving distinctive beliefs. We may even postpone it as an actuality. Therefore, without violating the traditional attitude of this Seminary we may properly urge that it has a mission today to impart a theology that is true to the Lutheran confessions.

It is not enough to confront the world today with that vague formula so frequently reiterated "back to God" or "the need of our day is a return to religion." Immediately the question follows—"What do you mean by getting back to God, who is this God, and what kind of God is he?" The church cannot capture the thinking, and give color and shape to the living of the present age unless it knows and bears witness to God in terms capable of claiming and molding the intellectual and spiritual loyalty of our age. A few years ago the late Henry VanDyke said that if he should be asked to design a coat of arms for the present times he would draw a

crest showing a question mark rampant over three bishops dormant. We may not accept the entire characterization. But we cannot escape the first part of it. And the age of the question mark rampant demands as the primary essential of an effective witness a theology of bold, clear, strong, worthy content. One who would make God known to this questioning world must be in possession of a first hand knowledge of God, and a way of witnessing to it that commands the response of this questioning age.

The reviving interest in Luther and the interpreters of Luther's theology is significant. It represents a correction long due. A swift survey of the changing scene of theological thought would show it moving away from the so-called "orthodoxy" of the post Reformation century toward the humanism that found varied expressions until in the beginning of the twentieth century it came to its climax in the liberalism that fascinated so many minds. It was as though men of good intent were so impressed by the faulty structure of this present world, and so captivated by the vision of the new Jerusalem that they saw only one duty of the religious life, that of building "the brave new world." It was a task to engage the best skills and intelligence of advanced modern society, always, of course in the name of God. Summon the architects, survey the site, draw the blue prints, organize the workers, develop the techniques, enact the enabling and regulatory legislation, and so bring the new Jerusalem down out of heaven. The social gospel became the total gospel for many, and the "quest for the good life in the here and now" the chief end of man. With a Babel-like pride which ignored Christ's first requirement for entrance into the Kingdom of God, men essayed the construction of the city of God.

It was no doubt the very baldness of these assumptions by the planners and builders of the new world that started the pendulum swinging in the opposite direction. A corrective set in which carried theological thought to the contrary extreme. Men became so impressed by the divine element in the "divine-human encounter" that their thinking came to focus largely upon the otherliness of God, and the other worldly interests of religion, and to all effects it lost sight of the implications of the Christian message for the life of

the world that now is, as well as that which is to come. The apocalyptic became an absorbing interest, until the charge could be made that neo-orthodoxy was concerned only with the salvation of the individual—an essentially selfish motive—and that this salvation was largely a theological transaction in a future world.

The contemporary interest of theological thought seems to be in turn a corrective for this extreme. We are now exploring and learning to appreciate and apply those profound insights that characterize the best of Luther's preaching and writing. We are seeing afresh the inclusiveness of the Christian Gospel. We are appropriating the richness of its limitless resourses so adequately described by St. Paul in his letter to Titus. "For the grace of God hath appeared bringing salvation to all men, instructing us to the intent that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave Himself for us that He might redeem us from all iniquity and purify unto Himself a people for His own possession (a peculiar people) zealous for good works!"

A theology that is soundly and faithfully Lutheran includes *all* the insights of that "Little Gospel," with all its implications for time and eternity. It is no mere humanism baptized lightly and easily into the name of Christianity. It is profoundly aware of the grace of God. And because it knows the need for God's grace it is aware of the reality of sin. It avoids the facile supposition that life is inherently good and may grow progressively better and better just by giving full opportunity to the powers of man to realize themselves. It sees sin as a tremendous, damning reality, and knows that there is no power on earth that can save man from sin and the evil effects of the out-working of sin, even in this world. It is fully aware that there is no salvation from sin except by God's act of intervention, and that God is the initiator in the work of redemption. "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son" and "salvation is in Him and in none other." It believes that "God was in Christ Jesus reconciling the world unto Himself." "The grace of God hath appeared bringing salvation to

all men." A theology that is adequate must be squarely fixed upon that truth, the doctrine of the grace of God. Salvation does not begin with the will or the desire of man, but with the nature and will of God. It is not man's quest for the knowledge of God, but God's eternal quest through the Incarnation and that means the whole life, death, and resurrection of His Son, the shepherd who seeks the one lost sheep until He finds.

> I sought the Lord and afterward I knew
> He moved my soul to seek Him, seeking me
> It was not I that found, O Saviour True
> No, I was found of Thee.
> I find, I walk, I love, but O the whole
> Of love is but my answer Lord to Thee,
> For Thou wast long aforehand with my Soul
> Always Thou lovedst me.

Here Christian experience begins, where the free, unlimited, unmerited grace of God meets the sin and need of man with the redemptive victorious power of the cross and the resurrection. And from this experience, as from a living source, flows the life that expresses itself in a sober, righteous, godly walk and conversation in this present world. There is no warrant for the charge that Lutheran and Pauline theology is concerned only with other worldliness and has no interest in redeeming and transforming the life of this present world. It is intensely concerned with that. But it knows that it cannot proceed without that dynamic, the divine grace operative through the lives of men united with Him in living spiritual union. And this life of Christian fellowship never loses sight of its millenium. It does not make its plans and originate its devices and activities under the stress of a crisis, a dramatic denouement, a sudden cry at midnight. But it does live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world, "looking for the blessed hope, and appearing of the glory of God and His Son Christ Jesus."

The man of God, to be "adequate, fully furnished" for the work of testifying effectively to this age, must be at home in a theology that includes the entire range of Christian truth revealed

in God's word. His theology must recognize the reality and consequences of sin, and be able to see and deal with the life of society in all its expressions in the light of this reality. It must acknowledge, receive and live by the revelation of God, coming to the full expression of grace in the cross. It must make him a channel for the work of the Holy Spirit, a true member of the holy, catholic church, the communion of the saints. And it must lead him to live in the light of Christianity's blessed and eternal hope.

It shall be my earnest purpose to maintain this ideal in all the work and teaching of the Seminary as it seeks to prepare men for the holy office of the Word and the Sacraments.

3. Seminary training today has yet another important function. It must develop ways and means of making its intellectual and spiritual results articulate. "That the man of God may be adequate" he must be in possession of the techniques, the special skills, for giving effectiveness to his store of religious resources. He who would "bring forth out of his treasure things both new and old," must first of all have a storehouse filled with treasures. But he must also have the hands and feet to carry the treasures out and set them before men. The seminary is deeply concerned about filling the storehouse. But it must also be concerned about the very practical matters of the hands and feet. It is not only an institution of higher education. It is a school for professional training. Its function is not completely fulfilled unless it sends into the places of leadership in the church men "equipped for every good work," fitted to cope with the complex demands of contemporary life and make intelligent contributions to the total life of the world today.

"That this people may know that thou art God" requires more than a pious shaking of the head and clucking over the heedlessness and godlessness of the present generation. It means a thoroughly trained, scientific, and constructive approach to the whole problem of preaching, pastoral care, religious education and community life.

This is especially important in the American scene. It is significant that exchange students and professors invariably com-

ment upon one marked difference between the theological training in American schools and in those of Europe. Here substantial attention is given to the practical disciplines. In the theological faculties of the European universities the curriculum includes little in the practical fields while it centers wholly upon biblical, theological and historical studies. That is to be explained partly by the differing concept of the relation of church and state. In a Lutheran land, for example, where every individual is born into the church and his relationship to it is a matter of course, there is not as in America the urgent pressure upon the church to awaken and develop that interior consent which gives motivation to one's religious choices and activity.

Without discussing the relative merits of the two systems, we may observe that the very nature of church life in America, as well as the developing life of society throughout the world, demands a theological training which maintains a sound balance between the accumulation of inner resources and the sharpening of the instruments for making them effective.

One of my teachers added a significant word to Phillipps Brooks' classical definition of preaching—"the communication of truth through personality." "Preaching," said he, "is the communication of divine truth with a view to persuasion."[2] That penetrating word is applicable to every phase of religious culture. It keeps before us the end of it all. To know God is not simply to know a definition of God. Religious knowledge is not just an accumulation of truth. The ends of religious training have not been served merely by developing and setting forth a system of doctrine. Truth must be presented "with a view to persuasion." That is, the religious effort aims at a transforming result in the lives of men.

Preaching is, in one aspect, the proclamation of certain great truths. But it does not end with that. It must have a deep and serious purpose, the translation of its eternal living message into new life. It is the proclamation of truth with zeal, skill, and the burning desire that the hearer shall be possessed by the truth as

2 Dr. Jacob A. Clutz, paraphrasing T. Harwood Pattison.

is the preacher. It is a St. Paul pleading not his own case but the case of Jesus Christ, with such fervor that his judge recognizes the passion behind the speech and exclaims, "would you with a little persuasion make me a Christian too?" It is the spirit and purpose that [illegible] in the preacher's earnest re[illegible]d [illegible] not only t[illegible] me this day might become as I am except these bonds." It is the eager outreach of the soul to touch and communicate life to another soul. It is an apostle saying, "we are ambassadors on behalf of Christ, as though God were entreating by us, we beseech you, be ye reconciled to God." It is the work of the true pontifex.

And every impact of the man of God ought to be, in its own way, "with a view to persuasion." It should issue in the transforming experience. The pastoral ministry is not a perfunctory round of conventional calls, carefully recorded and reported in maximum at the annual congregational meeting. It is the purposeful expenditure of personality resources. It is the applied skill of God's man dealing with the tensions, anxieties, frustrations, sorrows, doubts and perplexities of God's flock, intelligently and effectively for the purpose of healing.

Christian education is no longer a three- or six-month period of memory work in the short catechism. It is a dignified, scientific program of nurture, aiming through the most effective instruments and skills at the vital infusion of divine truth, so that the total personality is "persuaded," possessed by the living power, which makes one a new creature in Christ Jesus.

The entire life of the community—farm and factory, school, recreational facilities, housing, institutions, home and family—the whole social scene has come to be with increasing urgency the concern of the church and its ministry. Here the demands placed upon the man of God by modern life are particularly exacting. To meet them adequately requires more than an amiable good will, and a determination to "do good unto all men." It requires first a deep discernment of the nature and underlying causes of personal and social maladjustments, and then a thoroughly instructed and highly developed ability to deal with the whole problem.

All of this means that the so-called practical departments of the seminary must be maintained at the highest level of effectiveness. It demands a coordination of the work of all departments, so that the whole man shall be wholly trained, "completely furnished" for every good work. It raises a question moreover which the church and its seminaries must face. Is the present, traditional three-year period sufficient to equip the man of God that he may be adequate? Does the increasingly expanding and complex life of our age require a more thorough, mature, and extended training of God's man? Shall the physician of souls be prepared for his mission with less diligence than the physician of bodies?

That the issues involved in the changing life of society shall be recognized, carefully considered and dealt with sympathetically, that the program of seminary training shall include always the "view to persuasion," I give assurance now.

As our Seminary moves into the second quarter of its second century, it may move with confidence if its vision of purpose is clear, its dedication to Christ entire, and its reliance upon the sufficiency of God implicit. My prayer to the great Head of the Church shall continually be offered that my powers, insufficient of themselves, may be wholly dedicated to these ends. And I invite the prayers and the labor of the church to the end that through us as instruments God may be glorified, that His Kingdom may come and His will may be done, on earth as it is in heaven.

Notes and Studies

MUHLENBERG AS PASTOR

Sim Southard

Henry Melchior Muhlenberg was a pioneer in the cure of souls in Colonial America. This missionary Lutheran pastor blended executive ability with human understanding to organize and minister to the scattered Lutherans in Pennsylvania. His journals are full of illustrations of his ministry to individuals sick in soul and body and to congregations sick of strife and jealousy.

Muhlenberg's pastoral theology was based upon his early training at Halle. He quoted his teachers as saying that one must build from the inside of a man to the outside. People must have something better before they will give up something worse.[1]

But Muhlenberg was not content to stand on tradition alone. He felt that young ministers should have practical experience as well as academic training: "When we study in warm rooms, hear lectures, and work with books, we are trained in a soft way of life. We learn little of the trials and the life of poor people in their households, little of the disadvantages and advantages of their way of living. Accordingly we are not in a position to judge how hard or how easy it may be for them to combine secular and spiritual callings."[2] Muhlenberg was always encouraging his people to read the truths of the Bible and investigate whether they are not confirmed by experience.[3]

In working out his pastoral theology, Muhlenberg saw the difficulty of applying the general rules of the Bible to the case of

1 *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg* (Philadelphia, 1942), 2 vols.; Vol. I, p. 268.
2 *Ibid.*, I, 378.
3 *Ibid.*, I, 323.

an individual.[4] His German background gave him a different cultural outlook, so that he pleaded for the growth of a native ministry.[5] He agreed with the saying that German pastors were blind during their first seven years in America. Yet he preached to German, Dutch, Swedish, and English congregations with understanding and conviction.

Perhaps the secret of his successful ministry to such diverse groups, and his application of general Scriptural truths to individuals, was his knowledge of the basic relationship between the pastor and his people: "As a rule, at the first awakening there exists between the awakened listener and the awakening preacher a relationship of tender love or dependence, which is gradually improved after further growth."[6]

Muhlenberg sought to be an instrument of grace not only in personal counseling, but also in the many church quarrels which threatened the newly-established congregations. He looked upon himself as an instrument to help the congregation. He acted with prudence and firmness in the face of quarreling laymen and jealous ministers. Yet he knew the weakness of his judgments, and said that there were no oracles to give quick answers. Reason and one's own judgment are not safe. Therefore he prayed for the Holy Spirit to prevail despite his own sins and mistakes.[7]

Muhlenberg sought to apply his practical theology in every human situation he met. The individual cure of souls was always his greatest concern, even when he was weighed down by other pastoral duties. There was little time for study or the care of his own family.[8]

If Muhlenberg found that his parishioner was a converted man, he comforted him with Christian assurances. But if he found an unrepentant sinner, he attempted to bring about such a feeling

4 *Ibid.*, I, 377.
5 *Ibid.*, II, 295.
6 *Ibid.*, I, 162.
7 *Ibid.*, I, 513.
8 *Ibid.*, I, 177.

of guilt that the sinner would confess Christ and then gain comfort and spiritual strength.[9]

The care of physically ill people was an important pastoral task in Colonial America. Few competent doctors ventured to the colonies. Muhlenberg ministered herbs brought from Halle while he relieved the spiritual suffering as well.[10] He was well aware of the relationship between psyche and body: "I observed that there was not only a physical inflammation of the body, but also a spiritual inflammation of his conscience."[11] In dealing with the depression of an expectant mother, he recognized the part that physical weakness and emotional anxieties played in her spiritual depression. His comforting words were that "those who are heavy with child are the objects of the Lord Jesus' special concern."[12]

In the many cases of bereavement to which he ministered, Muhlenberg sought to distinguish between healthy and unhealthy grief. Excessive emotion and affectations led him to believe that heathen customs were still in the land. Yet he was tender to those who were truly bereaved: "When widows sorrow, but not like the heathen, let no one judge them."[13]

Private and public confession were used for spiritual cleansing and comfort. Often confession and communion were given as a last comfort to a dying Christian. The basis of Muhlenberg's authority in these acts was always the Scripture which he used to convict and lift up the sinner. To an anxious woman he quoted the power of God to forgive sins and hold her feet in His love. He used "consolations from the Word of God" for a blind mother, and gave her useful service in the church as bellwether.[14]

In dealing with mentally ill persons, Muhlenberg did not press rigorously for a pietistic confession of total sinfulness. He com-

9 Schindler, Carl J., "The Psychology of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg" in *Lutheran Church Quarterly,* XVI, pp. 50-59.

10 Ritter, John N., "Muhlenberg's Anticipation of Psychosomatic Medicine" in *Lutheran Church Quarterly,* XIX, pp. 181-188.

11 *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg,* I, 315.

12 *Ibid.,* I, 133.

13 *Ibid.,* I, 214.

14 *Ibid.,* I, 127.

forted a woman who could not sleep and who was tortured by a voice telling her that she was lost, by giving her the assurance that her sickness was unto life, not unto death.[15] Grace would match her sinfulness.

Muhlenberg had as much difficulty as the modern pastor with alcoholics and compulsive neurotics. He counseled the wife of an alcoholic to try to win him by quiet behavior. He admitted that he made little impression on her husband by admonishing him to repent.[16]

Verbal reassurances were unsuccessful with a compulsive neurotic whose anxiety tormented him by day while his nights were full of dreams of being justified. Yet the man was somewhat comforted by prayer, and asked Muhlenberg to preach his funeral on Isaiah 38:17, which was an accurate description of the patient's condition.[17]

Although Muhlenberg used a rigid theological system, it was a system full of his human understanding and prayers for divine power. The effectiveness of his personal ministry testified to the power of God at work in him.

THE BENEDICTION

George Drach

We finish The Service in our Lutheran churches with this Benediction: "The Lord bless thee, and keep thee. The Lord make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee. The Lord lift up His countenance upon thee, and give thee peace."

What is the meaning of this benediction? The first phrase is readily understandable. "Keep thee" means preserve and protect thee from all evil. But in the second and third phrases occur the words: "Make His face shine" and "Lift up His countenance." What do they mean?

15 *Ibid.*, I, 132.
16 *Ibid.*, I, 354.
17 *Ibid.*, I, 216.

In order to arrive at the right answer one must go back to the revelation of God in the Old Testament, for this benediction is an Old Testament benediction, sometimes called the high priestly benediction and also the Aaronitic benediction.

God told Moses to instruct the first high priest Aaron, Moses' brother, and Aaron's descendants as high priests, to pronounce this Old Testament benediction whenever they blessed the people of Israel. Moreover the following words were added to God's instruction: "And they shall put my Name upon the children of Israel, and I will bless them."

The name of God in the Old Testament is Jehovah (Jhvh). So this name was used whenever the benediction was pronounced. Having revealed Himself as the true God under this name and title, in distinction from the names of the man-made gods of the nations surrounding Israel, no other name was to be used in the service and worship of Israel. This name designates God as the Supreme Being, literally the "I am," the One who is existence in Himself and in all living things and beings.

"His face" is a unique Old Testament designation for the manifestation of God. Persons are known by their faces. The expressions of the face indicate feelings and attitudes. A pleasant, bright and beaming face indicates a kindly disposition toward them to whom it is turned. "Make his face shine," therefore, expresses the goodwill of God, whose desire is to be gracious. Face and countenance are synonymous. "Lift up his countenance" means that God does not turn away His face in displeasure to inflict punishment, nor look down in anger to condemn, but looks up in eagerness to bless him over whom the benediction is pronounced.

While the usual form of prayer expresses an attitude of approach to the grace of God in reliance on His word and promise, the benediction rises to the actual impartation of God's grace, culminating in peace between God and man, which is the highest and best possible gift that man can desire or God can impart.

Martin Luther once explained the New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament benediction somewhat as follows: It means that when we receive the benediction we receive the bless-

ing of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. The Lord, the Father, the Creator, blesses us in preserving our lives and in giving us all we need for our earthly existence. The Lord, the Son, the Redeemer, blesses us by His grace, forgiving us all our sins. The Lord, the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, blesses us by guiding us to repentance, faith and godly living to the end of life. All these blessings confer peace with God and eternal life through Jesus Christ in the New Testament.

THE BENEDICTION GESTURES

The usual benediction gesture in our American Lutheran churches is a lifting of both arms extended approximately at shoulder level, with the palms and fingers of both hands pointing at and over the worshiping congregation to indicate that the blessing of God as voiced by the liturgist is imparted on all who have worshiped, as if it were a laying on of hands on each and every one in the congregation. Reference to this gesture is found in Leviticus 9:22, where it is recorded that Aaron "lifted up his hand toward the people and blessed them."

Other gestures, variously used, call for a separation of the fingers of one or both hands, which has a twofold significance. The three fingers held together, including the thumb, first and second fingers, refer to the three phrases of the benediction, each of which contains two phases of blessing, indicated by the separated third and little fingers; or the three first fingers are held together, with the thumb and little finger separated from them.

The first phrase of the benediction declares the purpose of the Lord to "bless thee and keep thee," the second phrase to "make his face shine upon thee and be gracious unto thee," the third phrase to "lift up his countenance upon thee and give thee peace."

Either of these groupings of fingers requires a rather difficult physical operation. It is much easier to bend the third and little fingers down upon the palm, leaving the thumb and first two fingers upright. When this is done the further significance of the gesture relates to the existence of God in the three persons of the

Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Spirt, and, therefore, to the New Testament interpretation of the benediction. This gesture requires that one or both hands be raised above the head. Then when the word "peace" is pronounced either or both hands may be used to make the sign of the cross (signum), which indicates that the blessing is imparted through the redemption obtained by the cross of Christ. Some commentators hold that the German term *Segnen* is derived from this Latin word.

In Jewish tradition the following illustration is used: The priest pronouncing the benediction is like a trumpet. As it is not the trumpet which produces the sound but he who blows the trumpet, so God through the voice of the priest communicates the blessing.

THE APOSTOLIC SALUTATION

The Apostolic Salutation, sometimes called the New Testament benediction, is used liturgically at the close of minor services such as Matins and Vespers. It reads: "The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all." Actually this is not a benediction in the same sense as the Old Testament benediction, which was commanded directly by God Himself. Christ neither used nor commanded any form of benediction. The Apostle Paul wrote this threefold salutation at the close of his second letter to the Corinthians, as a parting salutation, fuller and more solemn than the ones ordinarily used by him in his other letters. Usually the Apostle closed his epistles with a more simple salutation with slight variations, as follows: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all." The tripartite form of the fuller salutation proclaims the heavenly gifts of the Holy Trinity "from Whom the three highest blessings of eternal salvation come to believers." The grace of Christ is mentioned first as the medium of the blessed relationship between God and believers in Christ, which also produces the efficaciõus work of the Holy Spirit. The love of God is mentioned in the second place because it is the principal

cause and source of the grace of Christ. Finally the fellowship of the Holy Spirit is mentioned as the effect of the grace of Christ and the love of God, bringing to perfection the work of the Triune God in the hearts and lives of Christians. The distinct personality and the essential deity of each person of the Holy Trinity is declared in the Apostolic Salutation, and it thus becomes a recognition and confession of the Trinity as the fundamental doctrine of Christianity.

It may be noted that every letter in the New Testament with the exception of James and I John, employs at the beginning or end or in both places, a salutation such as: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all." The Apostle Paul made this salutation a mark of identification, as stated in his second letter to the Thessalonians: "The salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every epistle: so I write." In several instances he enlarges the opening salutation as follows: "Grace to you and peace from God, our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ," or as in First Timothy, "Grace, mercy and peace from God, our Father, and Jesus Christ our Lord." Similar salutations either at the beginning or end of the letter are found in Hebrews, First and Second Peter, Second and Third John, and Jude. The opening salutation of Second Peter reads: "Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ our Lord." That of Second John reads: "Grace be with you, mercy and peace, from God the Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in truth and love." Any of these salutations, simple or more elaborate, could just as well be used as benedictions, were it not for the liturgical use of the one at the end of Second Thessalonians, which dates back to approximately the third century according to the Apostolic Constitutions.

A certain kind of benediction which is much less a benediction in the true sense, has found use in some occasional services. It has been borrowed from sources outside the Lutheran Church. It reads: "The Blessing of Almighty God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be with you alway." Then there is also the *Votum* after the sermon: "The Peace of God which passeth all

understanding, keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus." Also the shorter form after the Institution of the Lord's Supper: "The Peace of God be with you alway." Sometimes one hears in place of the benediction the prayer at the close of Hebrews: "Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do His will, working in you that which is well-pleasing in His sight through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory for ever and ever."

The German *Kirchenbuch,* which strictly adhered to the rule of using only what was in conformity with the "common consent of the pure Lutheran liturgies of the sixteenth century; and where there is not entire agreement, the consent of the largest number of those of greatest weight," uses no other benediction in any public service than that of the Old Testament, which in the truest sense is the only real benediction.

Book Reviews and Notices[1]

John the Baptist. By Carl H. Kraeling. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951. xii, 218 pages. $2.50.

Jesus said, "Among those born of women there has risen no one greater than John the Baptist." He regarded John as a prophet, but "more than a prophet," for he identified him with Elijah, who was expected to return and revive the long-silent voice of prophecy in order to prepare the way of the Lord. Yet when we turn from the Synoptics to the Gospel of John we find the Baptist reduced to nothing but "a voice" broadcasting in the wilderness. He is a light but not *the* light; he is not the Christ; he is not Elijah; he is not even "the prophet" of Deut. 18:15-18. His business is only to bear witness to the light and to decrease while Jesus increases.

Christian preachers generally have followed the Gospel of John in taking the Baptist as a model of self-effacing humility. But how can this picture of John be reconciled with what Jesus said about him? There is evidence in the New Testament and in Josephus which has always made trouble for the traditional harmonization. Historians, and therefore also theologians and preachers, have to ask how "the persuasions, the interests, the problems, and the conflicts" of those who transmitted our Gospel tradition may have affected their estimate of John the Baptist. In Mt. 11:11 Jesus' tribute is followed by a drastic qualification: "Yet he who is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." Is this qualification from Jesus himself, or is it the product of Christian polemic against some of the disciples of John who claimed that *he* was the Messiah?

Six years ago, Dr. Carl H. Kraeling, who is now professor of Hellenistic Oriental Archeology and Director of the Oriental Institute at the University of Chicago, made these questions the subject of his Haskell Lectures at the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology. These lectures are now published "substantially as delivered, with only such notes as seemed absolutely necessary." The six lectures deal with John the Baptist and the wilderness; John's preaching: the proclamation; John's preaching: the exhortation; John's rite of baptism; John the Baptist and Jesus; and the later history of the Baptist movement.

Dr. Kraeling has set down the essential facts about John the Baptist's life and work and thought and influence. Approaching the subject from the standpoint of the form-criticism of the Gospels, he studies these problems in the light of the archeological materials of the Near East and of the political and cultural conditions in which John the Baptist found himself involved. He examines the theories of J. Jeremias, J. Leipoldt, E. Lohmeyer, M. Goguel, R. Reitzenstein, and E. Eisler; and where he finds them inadequate he offers suggestions looking toward a better interpretation. His book is thoroughly documented by reference to the primary sources and is written in a clear and absorbing English style. It is a demonstration of historical criticism at its best —the kind of work that was never more needed than in our day of novelized "Lives" of Bible characters and of motion picture, radio, and television scripts which mix fact and fancy into mischievous distortions of the actual history.

John's mission, according to Dr. Krae-

---

1 Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

ling's interpretation of the evidence, grew out of a bitter personal experience. His father was a rural priest, and he was brought up among poor but pious people whose religion is described in the first two chapters of Luke. When he went up to Jerusalem to claim his hereditary rights as a priest he found his own ideals in sharp conflict with the conduct of the powerful and greedy circles of city priests who knew how to play politics with the Romans, and who controlled the Temple and its revenues. Filled with a prophet's anger at what he saw and experienced, he went down into the wilderness, not as a hermit protesting a corrupt civilization, but as a prophet to warn his countrymen to repent lest they be consumed by the fiery stream of judgment which was about to descend upon them. Their proud, complacent reliance on being descendants of Abraham could not save them. Jew or no Jew, *all* would have to repent and be baptized and actually practice the exemplary piety of Abraham, which consisted in going beyond the strict requirements of Law in one's devotion to God.

Theologians engaged in the current discussion of the views of Karl Barth on the ethical relevance of baptism will need to take into account Dr. Kraeling's conclusions concerning the meaning which baptism had for John the Baptist.

"John's baptism, then, may be said to have transformed the act of immersion, currently the favored medium of the search for higher purity, into a dramatization of the substance of the eschatological expectation, currently one of the most powerful elements of religious thought. In the combination of these two factors lay the secret of its success as a rite" (p. 118). As preached and practiced by John, baptism was not a sacrament. "Judaism throughout the many centuries of its history never produced a rite which was efficacious of and by itself, hence a sacrament, and it is doubtful whether John would have departed from the Jewish point of view in this particular" (p. 121). As an act of repentance, John's baptism "could mediate forgiveness without conferring it."

In submitting to John's baptism, Jesus submitted to the divine judgment which it symbolized, and upon his emergence from the water he actually saw himself "standing in the age of fulfillment, the heavens open in token of the presence of God with men, the voice of God speaking to him words of recognition and of acceptance into sonship and the Spirit descending upon him in accordance with the prophecies about the new age" (p. 155). Hence John became "in effect the reagent by which on the experiential side the elements of Jesus' distinctive Gospel were brought into precipitation."

Equally important was the impact of John's tragic death upon Jesus. In his effort to understand it Jesus came to see that "while the operation of God's own powers in the present bids his children rejoice even now in the fulfillment that is to be, men may find their lives maimed and crushed in the turmoil of the titanic struggle characterizing the transition, for violence is the order of the day" (p. 157). It was this line of thought that led Jesus "from the contemplation of his personal jeopardy toward the conception of his own place in God's plan."

This stress upon the experiential factor in the lives of Jesus and John the Baptist is what makes Dr. Kraeling's book vital today. There is a type of apologetic that lays such one-sided stress on the argument from the fulfillment of prophecy as to leave too little room for creative originality. In P. B. W. Stather Hunt's *Primitive Gospel Sources* (1951), for example, Jesus goes about fulfilling a kind of pre-Christian life of Jesus made up of the "testimonies" of Old Testament prophecy which virtually dictated the things he had to say and do in order to be and to prove that he was the Messiah. The prophetic factor is, of course, not to be neglected. But Dr. Kraeling's observation in criticism of Joachim Jeremias'

attempt to explain how proselyte ablution could have become Baptist baptism puts the matter in its true perspective: "Typological exegesis serves to explain the present but is not normally a factor in reconstituting the present. That would be putting the cart before the horse" (p. 105).

For his own day and generation John had "the significance of a heroic figure, stern, forbidding, provocative, fired with the heat of prophetic passion, calling men to self-humiliation before the throne of God. The fact that, in this capacity, he so deeply affected Jesus, his greater successor, assures him a place among the immortals of religious history" (p. 187).

RAYMOND T. STAMM

The Book of Thirty Centuries. By Stanley Rypins. New York: Macmillan, 1951. 420 pages. $7.00.

This is a book of facts about the formation, transmission, and translation of the Bible, from an objective, scholarly point of view. It is addressed primarily, according to the Preface, to the "average intelligent reader" who has no knowledge of Hebrew or Greek.

Stanley Rypins is professor of English at Brooklyn College, and as such feels that a familiarity with the Bible "is basic to modern man's cultural orientation." He has seen also that "prerequisite to something better than superficial understanding of the Old Testament . . . is a knowledge of Biblical Hebrew," and having equipped himself with such knowledge, attempts to convey to the layman some of the insights which he has thereby received. The reviewer feels that his book would have been of much more value had he, in accordance with Plato's concept of justice, confined himself to his own field to give up a thorough treatment of the "cultural values" of the Bible, perhaps in the tradition of von Herder, whose work on Hebrew poetry is now being rediscovered. Instead, we find in chapter I (Transmission of the Text) a descriptive catalog of the various manuscripts of the Old and New Testaments; in the next chapter (Nature of the Old Testament Text) a discussion of the transmission of the Old Testament text, and the work of the Masoretes. After this, two chapters entitled "Revision of the Old Testament Text," which deal with textual criticism and emendation on the basis of evidence from the versions and from conjecture. Here he gives numerous illustrations of emendation, but seems unaware that such emendations should be considered rather as exercises in advanced Hebrew composition than a "revision" of the Old Testament text, since hardly half of one per cent of all emendations have any chance of survival. The next chapters deal with the text of the New Testament and its criticism, the early versions of the Bible, and the printed Bible, carrying the history of translations down to the present day, in all of which standard opinion is fairly represented with very lavish documentation, which characterizes the book as a whole. The chapter dealing with the problems of the translator and the characteristics of the various English versions is well illustrated and one of the high points of this book. The final chapter deals with higher criticism, presenting the conclusions which are accepted by most biblical scholars of the present day.

In evaluating this book it is only fair to note that the author obviously has little or no interest in theology. In the one passage of the book where the word might most naturally be used, the author uses instead "theosophy." As a book of facts, it is quite useful, though the chapters on the Old Testament betray too often the author's dependence upon secondary sources which he sometimes misunderstands or accepts uncritically. The beginnings of cuneiform writing are no longer dated to 4500 B. C., but a thousand years later. The presence of Babylonian loan-words in Genesis does not give any

justification for believing that the oldest portions of scripture were either in Babylonian language or Babylonian script. In spite of such defects, the author tells the story very well of how the Bible was transmitted and translated to the present day, with many illustrations. The reader must not, however, expect to find here any help in understanding *why* the Bible is the "Book of Thirty Centuries."

GEORGE E. MENDENHALL

The Book of Jeremiah. Volume I: Jeremiah, Ch. 1-25. By Julius A. Bewer. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1951. 80 pages. 75 cents.

Professor Bewer here continues his excellent work. The little monograph before us is the fifth issue in Harper's Annotated Bible Series. The portion treated covers the so-called Logia of Jeremiah. It deals with prophecies delivered in the regions of Josiah and Jehoiakim which are really the most important deliverances of the prophet.

As in previous issues, the author supplies a concise but adequate introduction, discussing such matters as the times of Jeremiah, his work, his contribution to religion, and his book. The outline of the content of the book of Jeremiah as given by the author is well worth memorizing.

The comments, in the form of footnotes, are clear and up-to-date. Difficult words and phrases are fully explained and obscure points clarified. The marvel of the whole work is that so much material can be compressed into so small a volume. The ability to do that is always the sign of a great scholar, one who knows his subject so thoroughly that he can say what needs to be said simply and pointedly. The publishers are to be commended for their foresight in planning such a Bible series, and especially for selecting such a fine scholar to bring it to fulfillment.

J. M. MYERS

The Hebrew Impact on Western Civilization. Edited by Dagobert D. Runes. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. xiv, 922 pages. $10.00.

Heralded by its publishers as propaganda directed against intolerance, racial hatred, and irreligion, this volume of essays accomplishes its purpose in decidedly clumsy fashion. In the first place, it is written by a mixed company of scholars, hacks, sincere apologists, and special pleaders. Propaganda, as the very origin of the term in Catholic usage would seem to indicate, demands a believing and united congregation for its skillful direction. These eighteen varied and often discursive papers, in the second place, constitute too bulky a volume for any reader to hold. Nor will they all hold any one reader's attention.

Put on a table in the reference room, the book's index might be consulted. But what does one find? Any two articles are apt to give quite different impressions regarding a single entry. For example, Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy is presented under "Judaism and Music" (pp. 384, 386) with no slightest reference to his conversion, and as though Bach's St. Matthew Passion were some long-lost Jewish work. The facts regarding him appear incidentally in another essay (p. 802), demonstrating that he does not belong in this volume. What, in terms of the editor's preface (p. xi), did *he* give the world of his "Jewish heritage?" And how did the "Christian world" repay *him?*

Too much in the book is of the nature of a series of *non sequiturs* to the "case" Runes would present. Hebraism needs no "case" so crudely presented. But this is the editor's fault. Many individual essays here are of real merit.

CHARLES M. COOPER

The Master. By Max Brod. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. 426 pages. $4.75.

Meleager, a Greek intellectual in the employ of Pontius Pilate, falls in love

with Shoshana, the foster sister of Jesus. Through her he learns to know Judaism at its best, first in her own sincere piety, genuine chastity, and happy childlikeness, then in the stalwart idealism and sober determination of the zealots, and finally in the noble manhood and ethical grandeur of Jesus. He meets the Master in Galilee and traces his steps around the Galilean Sea. Later, in Jerusalem, he becomes a witness to the crucifixion of Jesus, the violent death of Shoshana, and the suicide of his friend Judas Iscariot. Returning to Galilee, he joins the zealot underground.

Very briefly told, this is the plot of Max Brod's novel. The author is a Zionist of Austrian-Jewish extraction who has become widely known for his historical novels and other books on the Jewish question. This is his latest work. It is based on sound historical research, yet not pedantic. It weaves many familiar biblical facts and sayings into the narrative, yet it does so with reverence and tact. The situations and characters are sketched with force and imagination. Some of the word pictures, such as the description of Lake Gennesaret, are exquisitely beautiful.

Nevertheless, it is difficult for the reader to get really interested in the story. The narrative seems to lack purpose and direction. It trails off as purposelessly as it begins. Two-thirds of the book are made up of interminable dialogues and letters. Brod hardly seems interested in the adventures of actual people. Their outward experiences serve only as an excuse for relating their inner feelings, thoughts, and convictions. Properly speaking, this is no novel. It is a myth. The main characters are only personified historical forces or ideas. Shoshana represents the Jewish people at their best. She might be a farm girl from a modern cooperative somewhere in the state of Israel. Jason-Judas Iscariot is the type of Jewish intellectual whose critical mind is corrosive, whose philosophy is nihilistic, and who constantly provokes the resentment of the non-Jewish world. The Master embodies the spirit of the prophetic religion of Israel, using this term in its widest meaning. Meleager is the type of sympathetic, cultured Gentile, driven by his idealism to side with the Jewish resistance movement, while the Romans personify antisemitism, especially in its most recent forms. Tuscus lacks only the swastika.

All this is very understandable. Brod belongs to a whole generation of European Jewish intellectuals who cannot cease to wrestle with the problem of Judaism. They are the generation who witnessed the failure of assimilation in Central and Eastern Europe and saw the rise of antisemitism, climaxing in the insane fury of Nazi persecution. Their writings are born of a deep spiritual anguish. And so one can read between the lines of this book the confessions of a modern Zionist. And somehow one becomes more attracted to the author himself than to the shadowy figures which he invented. This is the strength of the book, but also its weakness.

For unconsciously Brod has become a victim of the Nazi ideologies which he abhors. The Nazis considered religion a product of the national spirit (*Volkstum*). So does Brod. The Nazis rejected Jesus because he was a Jew. Brod loves him for the same reason. Of course, this one-sided view of Jesus forces him to bend the Gospel picture slightly. Critical sayings against Pharisees or Jews in general are minimized. Jesus' teachings are given partly in his own words, partly in quotations from the Old Testament prophets and from the Tannaim (!). The author ascribes to Jesus that Pharisaic view which made the advent of the Kingdom depend on a wholehearted repentance of the whole nation. Indeed, the Pharisees and the Jews in general are innocent of the death of Jesus which was engineered by the Romans and their despicable toadies, the Sadducees and priests. Jesus' claim to be the Son of God who could forgive sins was no issue at all and con-

sidered a moot point by the people at large. Even Judas had nothing to do with Jesus' death. The story of his betrayal was a colossal hoax, invented by the Romans in order to burden Judaism for all eternity with the guilt of killing their Messiah.

As Christians, we will rejoice in the fact that a Jewish intellectual shows so much love and respect for Jesus. He really gives some exceedingly fine word pictures of the Galilean ministry. But we would plead with him to see Jesus as he really is. Certainly, Jesus was a Jew, a loyal member of his people, steeped in its traditions and nurtured by its religion. Recent Christian scholarship has stressed this point consistently. But he was more than that. His proclamation of the Kingdom of God not only fulfilled, but far surpassed, Old Testament and scribal thought. His message of free love for the undeserving was revolutionary. His ministry and preaching were bound to provoke the Jews as well as the Romans. And he died for his claim of being the Christ, the Son of God. His voice should be heard above the cries of modern racism and nationalism. It might help to calm the fever of nationalism of every shade.

ULRICH S. LEUPOLD

The Church in History. By B. K. Kuiper. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Co., 1951. 499 pages. $4.95.

This volume has been prepared for use as a textbook in secondary schools. It has an attractive, clear, two-column page, and its outline of the course of history is well-organized both logically and typographically. About 150 illustrations, old and new, light up the pages. Time-lines and maps in generous provision preserve orientation. The vocabulary is simple, the style clear, concrete, and direct. Cross references, content guides, and a very full index add to both textbook and reference value. A useful feature is an unusually readable story of the development of the Church in the United States, containing a survey of the character, status, and growth of the various denominations and groups. Altogether this is a very good and useful as well as timely book and can be commended both to young students and to the mature who need a concise yet interesting survey of the whole history of the Church.

PAUL H. ROTH

The Church in the Purpose of God. By Oliver S. Tomkins. 118 pages. New York: World Council of Churches, 1951. 118 pages, paper. 50 cents.

In brief compass the author, a general secretary of the World Council and secretary of its Commission on Faith and Order, has not only told the story of the modern ecumenical movement but analyzed its achievements and difficulties and included some of the most important documentary material. Yet, despite all the factual data and illustrative passages, the style is highly informal and attractive. Specifically the booklet aims to introduce the reader to the preparations for the third world conference on Faith and Order which is scheduled for Lund, Sweden, in the summer of 1952. But I doubt that the reader will find so much of the history and purpose of the whole ecumenical movement anywhere within two covers as in this little study booklet. For study groups, or for individuals interested in knowing the whence, why, how, and whither of the ecumenical endeavor, here is the perfect introduction.

CONRAD BERGENDOFF

Protestant Thought in the Twentieth Century. Edited by Arthur S. Nash. New York: Macmillan, 1951. 296 pages. $3.75.

The middle of a century makes a convenient time to look backward and forward. For this point in this century a group of incisive essays has been prepared and issued in book form. With the

subtitle, "Whence and Whither?" the volume makes the necessary survey.

The essays cover the major areas of religious thought, each being prepared by a specialist in that field. Thus there are chapters analyzing what has transpired in the field of Old Testament research, in New Testament studies, in systematic theology, in the writing of church history, etc.

The result is not a dry, textbookish history of Protestant thought. Instead, the book is a collection of alert chapters on specific phases of religious scholarship. Each author of course writes from his own viewpoint. Yet the review in each field is sufficiently objective to constitute a reliable guide. Any pastor who desires to have a quick look into present-day trends will find this book distinctly helpful.

The word "Protestant" in the title is used in the sense in which religion is grouped as "Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish." Under such an understanding it is possible to include humanist and Unitarian thinkers. And the title should include the words "in America." The world-wide scene comes into view only in the last two chapters: "Reunion and the Ecumenical Movement" by Henry S. Leiper, and "Christianity and Other Religions" by John A. Mackay.

Essays of this kind can easily become merely annotated bibliographies. In this instance they are saved from such dullness by astute analysis and clear interpretation. Each chapter does have a brief bibliography, and the footnotes point to additional important literature. But even for the reader who does not desire to pursue the matter further the chapters will indicate the men whose writings have been most influential in the past five decades.

The general theme, repeated in most of the chapters, sees theological liberalism dominant at the opening of the century, soon to be colored strongly by the "social gospel," but thereafter to suffer decline and modification under "neo-orthodoxy." It represents the change in editorial viewpoint that took place in *The Christian Century* during these decades. It is characteristic of what has transpired in the divinity schools connected with universities. It may easily, and falsely, assume that the same changes occurred in the churches. For, quite obviously, confessional and conservative thought are largely ignored. It is for this reason that notices of Lutheran writers are few and scattered.

It is not difficult to charge the authors with over-simplifying the issues. But it cannot be denied that they have made their analyses quite clear. Walter M. Horton, writing on "Systematic Theology" discusses "liberalism chastened by tragedy." The developments in the philosophy of religion are outlined by George F. Thomas, of Princeton. Charles W. Gilkey has a difficult problem in selecting the data for his chapter on "Preaching," yet arrives at some interesting conclusions. H. Shelton Smith wrote on "Christian Education" against the background of the views of George A. Coe. The least satisfactory chapter is the one by the editor entitled "America at the End of the Protestant Era."

The book has as much unity as is to be found ordinarily between the several departments of a theological school. The archeological findings of W. F. Albright and the historical volumes by Kenneth S. Latourette do not seem to have much in common. Yet the chapters indicate how significantly theology, philosophy, biblical research, and ecumenical movements have affected each other, and will continue to do so.

W. D. Allbeck

Handbook of Denominations in the United States. By Frank S. Mead. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951. 207 pages. $2.75.

Intended, as the name implies, to serve as a convenient reference to the many religious bodies in the United States, this

book has a useful function to perform. Arranged alphabetically by families (Adventists, Baptists, Brethren, etc.), smaller and less known bodies can also be located through the comprehensive index. (Age to Come Adventists, Albanian Orthodox Church, Amana Society, etc.). Each body is treated in terms of history, doctrine, practice, polity, and current strength and location. The purpose is descriptive rather than comparative or polemical, and the author has succeeded in his attempt to remain objective. Minor mistakes and misleading generalizations ("less than ten per cent" of Lutheran clergymen have neither college nor seminary training, it is stated with something less than the full truth) are inevitable in such a compilation and do not detract from the high level of accuracy which the work has achieved. The busy clergyman who seeks quick access to the kind of information this book provides will be grateful for it and find many occasions to turn to it.

Early American Methodism, 1769-1844. Volume I: Missionary Motivation and Expansion. By Wade Crawford Barclay. New York: Methodist Board of Missions and Church Extension, 1949. xli, 449 pages. $3.50.

The ambitious project of preparing a six-volume History of Methodist Missions has begun auspiciously with the publication of this excellent first volume. After an introductory chapter on the Wesleyan heritage, the author treats the planting of Methodism in colonial America, the sinking of its roots in American soil, its territorial and numerical expansion, and the development of its missionary spirit and organization to 1844. Based as it is on painstaking research into a great variety of sources, which are carefully accounted for in the extensive documentation, the volume handles controverted topics (like the location of the first Methodist church) with circumspection and impartiality and throws vivid light on many a more commonplace topic (like the opposition of Anglicans to the early Methodist societies). The narrative is moving and colorful even when it is studded with statistical and chronological data. In fact, the wealth of detail here assembled and interpreted constitutes the volume's great distinction and sets it apart from the usual run of denominational histories. The work is a mine of information in which historians of all religious persuasions will dig to their profit for a long time to come.

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

Martin Luther: His Life and His Labor. By William Dallmann. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1951. 262 pages. $3.50.

On the basis of a considerable, though not always critical, knowledge of Luther and his times, the venerable author of this book presents a racy life of the Reformer which is intended for popular consumption. Luther himself is frequently quoted, and the colorful text is accompanied with many illuminating pictures of buildings, persons, and scenes. A sample of the style: "Some fanatics had direct talks with the Holy Ghost, despised the 'dead' Bible, scoffed at Infant Baptism, insisted believers be again baptized, and were called 'Again-baptizers,' Anabaptists."

Luther in den Wandlungen seiner Kirche. By Horst Stephan. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1951. 135 pages. DM 1.50.

In 1907 the Leipzig historian who later turned to Systematics published a revealing study of the various ways in which Luther was interpreted by his German followers in the course of almost four centuries. The Orthodoxists of the seventeenth century made him over in their own image, the Pietists transformed him into a Pietist, the Rationalists into a Rationalist, etc. Now Stephan has extended his earlier study to include more recent interpretations "in the century of

crisis." He refers to the fact that sources and tools are now available to understand Luther better, and to the impulse given to reinterpretation by Karl Holl. Holl has since been corrected, but no generally accepted interpretation of Luther has as yet emerged. Rudolf Thiel has written under the influence of the racial myth of the 1930's. Neo-Lutherans like Werner Elert and Ernst Sommerlath are still under the influence of Romanticism. Karl Barth and his followers have Calvinized Luther.

Apokalyptisches Wetterleuchten: ein Beitrag der Evangelischen Kirche zum Kampf im "Dritten Reich." By Heinrich Schmid. Munich: Verlag der Ev. Lutherischen Kirche in Bayern, 1947. 459 pages.

Kirche im Kampf: Dokumente des Widerstands und des Aufbaus in der Evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands von 1933 bis 1945. By Heinrich Hermelink. Stuttgart: Rainer Wunderlich Verlag, 1950. 710 pages. DM 12.50.

In a world which is growing calloused toward crises, the church's struggle against Nazi totalitarianism tends to be forgotten. Today attention centers on the crisis of Christianity in China or in countries sealed off by the Iron Curtain. Yet, in light of present developments, the contest with Naziism assumes the role of a full-scale dress rehearsal in the modern church's fight for life.

The two books under review are useful contributions toward a better understanding of what actually went on in the church during the years of Hitler's regime. Both books reflect a South German point of view.

Heinrich Schmid's *Apokalyptisches Wetterleuchten* narrates the struggle in terms of apocalyptic ultimates wherein the power of God contends with demonic forces of evil. Schmid wishes to set the record straight with respect to the combat performance of the Lutheran Churches of Bavaria and Württemberg. This frequently leaves something to be desired when the author touches upon certain key incidents as, for example, the crucial confessional synod at Bad Oeynhausen (1936), which he glosses over without hinting at its real significance for the estranged partners in the common struggle. Nor does he treat clearly the rise of relationships which, in the postwar period, led to an unprecedented movement toward Lutheran union. A corresponding weakness is obvious in a work by Martin Niemöller's brother. Wilhelm Niemöller's *Kampf und Zeugnis der Bekennenden Kirche* (Bielefeld, 1948) presents the North German point of view, represented by the so-called Confessing Church, whose greatest strength and activity lay in the territory of the Old Prussian Union.

In terms of interpretation Schmid's work offers less than the short but revealing story by Heidelberg's Edmund Schlink entitled *Der Ertrag des Kirchenkampfes* (Gütersloh, 1947). Nor does it provide a survey of forces against which the churches and the Christian faith had to contend as, for example, Walter Kuenneth (Erlangen) succeeded in doing in his able analysis, *Der grosse Abfall* (Hamburg, 1947). What Schmid does—and this is useful—is to present an account of how the church struggle appeared to many a Bavarian Lutheran. This fact in itself reveals one of the basic internal difficulties with which the church had to grapple while resisting the Nazi brand of totalitarianism: it was the difficulty of confessionalism compounded with provincialism.

Those desiring access to the sources will find Heinrich Hermelink's *Kirche im Kampf* a valuable documentary collection. This former professor of church history at Marburg, now residing near Munich, covers the twelve years of Naziism. The coverage is not complete, nor is the selection always to the point. But the volume contains many revealing

documents which throw light on hitherto obscured operations among the staunchly Lutheran partners in the struggle. Here one can conveniently trace the steps toward Lutheran cooperation. Here, too, leaders like Hans Meiser, bishop of Bavaria, and especially Theophil Wurm, bishop of Württemberg, assume new stature in courageous writings from their own pens.

Hermelink's collection is admittedly weak in materials from northern Germany. The destruction of the archives of the Confessing Church in the bombing of Wuppertal explains the omission in part. His earlier documents are largely from Joseph Gauger's indispensable collection, *Chronik der Kirchenwirren* (edited by the son, Joachim Gauger, in three volumes, 1933-1935). Others are taken from Kurt Dietrich Schmidt, *Bekenntnisse des Jahres 1933,* etc. (Göttingen, 1933, 1934, 1935). Still others come from current parallel collections such as Erik Wolf's (Freiburg) *Zeugnisse der Bekennenden Kirche* (Stuttgart, 1946 ff.) and Joachim Beckmann's representative selection in *Kirchliches Jahrbuch* (Gütersloh, 1948) for the years 1933-44.

For Protestants Hermelink provides a companion volume to an earlier and vivid Roman Catholic work by Munich's auxiliary bishop Johannes Neuheusler, *Kreuz und Hakenkreuz,* 2 vols. (Munich, 1946).

Lutherans in America would do well to study carefully the alliance of forces and combination of circumstances which were involved in the German church struggle. There one can trace, with ghastly realism, the rise within Protestantism and in the homeland of the Reformation of an ideological battle which continues to sweep in manifold form across Europe and Asia. Nor is its insidious power foreign to America, where Christians may only be beginning to see the fuller import of this age's struggle for a saving faith and for the return of human dignity under the living God.

E. Theodore Bachmann

Dream and Reality. An Essay in Autobiography. By Nicolas Berdyaev. Translated from the Russian by Katherine Lampert. New York: Macmillan Company, 1951. 332 pages. $4.50.

This is the last of Berdyaev's numerous works, published posthumously. We have here an outline of all his philosophical treatises given as they developed in his own stormy but eventful life. The translator did her work so well that it reads as if it might be an original English work.

The biographical facts, very frankly but just as modestly given, are as thrilling as any writer of fiction could make them. Berdyaev was born an aristocrat in Czarist Russia. He was among those who, from student days on, agitated for freedom. This led to his banishment twice, his periods of exile however being shortened through the influence of friends. It was thus that he was involved in the revolution that almost overthrew the old Czarist regime after the Russo-Japanese War in 1905 and later in its complete overthrow in 1917. However, in the events that followed, his struggle for freedom had to be continued because the old order had only been supplanted by the more radical tyranny of the Bolshevists. So he again had to leave Russia, and this time joined the *emigres,* first in Berlin, later in Paris, where he did most of his voluminous literary work. Again and again he reminds us that he is a philosopher, not a theologian. However, his is a theological philosophy, if not a philosophical theology.

In this volume one may say that we have Berdyaev's philosophy of Spirit stated genetically. His view of Spirit is pantheistic. God's Spirit and man's are the same. Man needs God, but God also needs man. In common with Orthodox theology, Berdyaev's understanding of Christ is determined by the incarnation, not by the atonement. This may be said to be true even of the Nicene Creed.

Then his view of the world relates it-

self to one of India's philosophies—the same that Buddha followed. Pure spirit became entangled with matter. This leads to its enslavement. Here Berdyaev uses the word tragedy where Buddha would use the word suffering. So far they go together. But then Berdyaev parts from that Oriental philosophy. Buddha would flee from the world; Berdyaev would win freedom over it by his own creative spirit. The sufferings of Christ in his view are the crowning exhibition of such victory. The victory will be that of the Spirit. The absolute thus returns to itself in this philosophy as the freedom of the creative spirit.

The East never has had the tutelage of law. Sin and atonement do not figure in it. In its emphasis on the triumph of spirit lies the merit of this philosophy. But it does not take into account the demands of God's holiness. This last volume by Berdaev moves in the right direction in its making spirit central. But it is my conviction that it needs to give place to what has been called the metaphysics of conscience to complete it.

JOHN ABERLY

Separated Unto God. By John Christian Wenger. Scottdale, Pa.: Mennonite Publishing House, 1951. 350 pages. $3.50.

Prepared at the request of the General Problems Committee of the Mennonite General Conference, this volume presents an illuminating treatment of the major areas of nonconformity with the world as Mennonites, Brethren, and, to some extent, Quakers think of it. The lucidly written book deserves to be read by those of other persuasions who are willing to give a hearing to an earnest Christian testimony and who desire to understand the positions of their separated brethren. Among the many topics discussed are the use of tobacco, alcohol, radios, and televisions, personal adornment and the use of wedding rings and cosmetics, membership in secret societies and other clubs, close communion and feet washing, labor unions and investments, participation in war, and the exercise of the franchise. Extensive bibliographies enhance the reference value of the volume.

The Christian Understanding of God. By Nels F. S. Ferré. New York: Harper, 1951. 277 pages. $3.75.

Dr. Ferré, from whose assembly line books are now rolling off at the rate of one or two each year, is professor of Philosophical Theology at Vanderbilt University School of Religion. Here he definitely lives up to his title. His earliest books, such as *The Christian Fellowship* and *The Christian Faith,* had a positive Christian emphasis and a style that is clear and readable. His later works, *Faith and Reason, Evil and the Christian Faith,* and *Christianity and Society,* gravitated more and more from Nygren to Whitehead and engaged in ever bolder flights of philosophical speculation. His present ambition is to create a new "philosophical theology" which develops the metaphysical implications of Christian faith. He proposes to liberate Christianity from alien ways of thinking which ever since Augustine have distorted its content and to produce a fresh Christian system of thought for the present day.

To be authentic Christian theology such an attempt would have to start from the faith itself. It would require first of all a firm grasp of the constitutive concepts of the original Christian *kerygma,* making use of the work of such scholars as Dodd and Bultmann. But this is not Ferré's procedure. He does not start either with God's revelation of himself in Christ or with "how we come to know God or our experience of him," but plunges at once into a metaphysics of "the nature and work of God himself."

This method is made possible by the fact that the author has committed himself beforehand to a new set of philosophical categories, those of the Whiteheadian process philosophy. Most readers are

likely to feel that Christianity has been liberated from the older ways of thinking only to be chained to a new type of alien philosophy. But even for one who is willing, the required thorough mental re-orientation will be no easy task. He may find himself in the predicament of a minister of Ferré's own denomination (Methodist) who had been deeply impressed by the author's earlier writings. After a vain struggle with the first three or four chapters of the present book he laid it aside, saying that he simply could not understand it. Since he had already purchased the book, I sought to point out that he could still salvage something from it by skipping to the last three chapters which are clearer and more Christian.

The concept of God which results from the blending of Christian and Whiteheadian thought is a *tertium quid* that bears some resemblance to both sources but cannot be identified with either. Those who are familiar with Whitehead's attempt to synthesize theism and pantheism will not be surprised to meet such statements as "God is ever part of his personal creation" and "God both *is* and *has* a body." But Whitehead's cohesive world process now takes on the distinctive character of love. Ferré's central purpose is to explore "the adequacy of Christian love to constitute the category of categories for the realms of being and becoming." His affirmation of love as the nature of ultimate being appears at first sight to be true to evangelical theology, but closer scrutiny reveals its wide divergence from the thought of Paul and of the Reformers. When God as love, rather than God as God, is made the starting point, and when that love is conceived as a rationally obvious cosmic process bent upon human welfare, then it loses its character as the sovereign, unconditioned, unmeritable, and incomprehensible love of God. Hence holiness becomes only "love's negative work in relation to sin," and divine absoluteness merits only a few scattered references instead of systematic treatment. Dismissing so lightly basic elements in the concept of God, the author is free in one short work on God to devote chapters to such topics as the incarnation, the atonement, and eschatology. The procedure is all the more surprising in view of the fact that this book is only one volume of a projected comprehensive theological system.

Ferré sees in Jesus a radical new revelation of divine love, as adequate as such a revelation can be in the life of a historical individual. He distinguishes not only between the historical Jesus and the eternal Christ but also between the true Christ in Jesus and the full Christ revealed in the Church. On the whole, Ferré's Christology is closer to the Gospel than his reflection on God. The speculative element, however, is manifest in such statements as "We have no way of knowing that Jesus was sinless" and "Whether or not the human personality of Jesus rose [from the dead] we have no way of knowing for certain." Jesus could have been the son of a Roman soldier who seduced Mary; the incarnation would still be valid. The Virgin Birth has only symbolic significance: "No one is born into the level of God's own Agape without a Virgin Birth."

The final chapter contains some peculiar eschatological speculation. In view of the emphasis on a eudaemonistically conceived love as the ultimate nature of reality, it is not surprising to find the belief in eternal punishment condemned as insult and blasphemy. There is no inkling of insight into that deeper faith which relinquishes all human claims against God and allows God to be God in the fullness of his holy sovereignty, the faith that led both Luther and Calvin to accept a "resignatio ad infernum." Hell, like all evil and suffering, is interpreted as a reclamatory instrument of love. There is place even for purgatory. "Hell is for the bad; purgatory for the good."

This book is a striking illustration of the gap that exists in American theology between exegetical scholarship and creative thinking on the meaning of the Chris-

tian message. Ferré is a competent philosopher but his grasp of scriptural exegesis is pitifully weak. He is a kind of modern Marcion who pounces upon the idea of agape but gives it a strange speculative twist. The aberrations in both the ancient and the current Gnosticism are traceable to the fact that non-Christian ways of thinking do not merely supply the vehicle of expression but invade and modify the Gospel itself. Scripture enters into Ferré's argumentation only secondarily in the form of incidental references and detached sentences, and even then with little regard for sound exegesis. Thus he sees Trinity implied in "Let us make man in our image," interprets "crucified through weakness" as weakness in Jesus, and rejects eternal damnation on the basis of "Love never faileth" and "His mercy is everlasting."

While this book contains some stimulating ideas for the philosophically inclined, it represents the private theorizing of one warm-hearted and keen Christian thinker rather than *The Christian Understanding of God.*

T. A. Kantonen

Christologie. By Heinrich Vogel. München: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1949. 477 pages. DM 26.

This is the first volume of a projected Christology by the professor of Systematic Theology at the "Kirchliche Hochschule," operated by the Confessing Church in Berlin under the Nazi terror. Previous works by the author include *Die eiserne Ration des Christen,* a lay dogmatics intended chiefly for soldiers, also a poetic version of the psalms and a number of new hymns, the vitality of which is demonstrated by their enthusiastic use at the recent "Kirchentag" in Berlin.

Dr. Vogel follows the traditional division, and in this volume treats of the person of Christ. In the introduction he emphasizes that Christology is possible only from within the circle of faith. Christ cannot be called into question since it is he who questions all men and puts them under judgment. The "Christ question" is the "God question." The mystery of Christ is not the mystery of human personality. Christ is not another Socrates in whom the human "eros" is personified. He is not the founder of another religion; he is the end of all religions. All Christology is but an exposition of the text, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself" (II Cor. 5, 19).

The second chapter discusses the name of Christ and shows Jesus, not as the coming true of soothsayer's predictions, but as the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy. As God's name reveals his true being, so does Jesus the Christ reveal God's true being. "Name, person, way, and work are one."

The third chapter treats of the person of Christ. The absolute ground of the incarnation is not in any rational necessity but in the boundless love of God. The relative ground lies in the sin of man. The incarnate Christ is the absolute paradox. "The contradiction which faith humbly accepts, and against which the offense revolts in despair and defiance, is an ontological contradiction which experiences an ontological reconciliation and overpowering" (pp. 201 f.). The remainder of the chapter deals with the true humanity of Christ in refutation of all docetism. It ends with a powerful plea to the world to "Behold the Man!"

The book represents a substantial contribution to Christological literature. It is particularly valuable for the use it makes of Kierkegaard and Heidegger. It gives a clear analysis of what is involved in the paradoxical as the sign of the conclusive miracle (pp. 170 ff.). Heidegger's analyses of existence are made use of, and they are at the same time corrected by the Gospel. The book is valuable also for its complete rooting in the Scriptures. It is marred by its verbosity, its repetitiousness, and the Heideggerian habit of stringing words together

endlessly, as, for example, "ein absolutes Von-Gott-ueberhaupt-nichts-Wissen." It seems that none of us escape the idiosyncrasies of the Zeitgeist.

MARTIN J. HEINECKEN

The Person and Work of Christ. By Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield. Edited by Samuel G. Craig. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co., 1950. 575 pages. $4.50.

This is the second volume of reprinted articles by the late scholarly Princeton professor. In reading these christological studies, to which three sermons by the author are appended, one realizes again with deep gratification that in the area of the second article of the Apostles' Creed there is a great unanimity in conservative Protestant teaching. It would be hard to find anything of fundamental importance in these articles to which Lutherans cannot whole-heartedly subscribe. Among the very best chapters in the book are the ones on Christless Christianity and The Essence of Christianity and the Cross of Christ. Here particularly the author scorns all efforts at devising a subjective or idealistic Christianity and insists that Christianity has a right of existence only as based on the historic facts of Christ's incarnation and redemptive work. He is perhaps too exclusively committed to Anselm's theory of the atonement, for admittedly this saving work of God is so incomprehensibly great that even Scripture does not present it under one figure of speech but under various. In his ardent defense of the divine-human nature of Christ one can understand why he shies at the R. V. translation of Phil. 2:7—"(he) emptied himself"—but modern research seems to support that rendering, nor can we without doing violence to Scripture eliminate the problem of the kenosis from Christian doctrine. We fully agree with the editor's statement in the introduction: "No doubt if Warfield were writing today he would not overlook or ignore the writings of John Knox, D. M. Baillie, Martin Dibelius, Anders Nygren, and Gustaf Aulén, not to mention others, but we may be sure there would be no change in his affirmative teaching regarding the person of Christ and His redeeming work grounded as it was on the teaching of the New Testament."

The volume offers very fascinating and inspiring reading. The publishers are to be congratulated on again making this excellent material available and thus rendering a definite service to the Church.

EMIL W. MATZNER

Truth of Life—Key to Understanding. By Ambrose G. Beltz. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. 608 pages. $6.00.

How to live happily and at peace: that is the theme of this book. The author's prescription combines elements of Judaism, Unitarianism, and humanism, with humanism in its psychological aspects greatly predominating.

The first two sections of the book describe the ways in which the human nervous system operates. Understanding of the way that system works, states the author, is the inescapable essential of satisfactory living. A great number and variety of illustrations are used in these sections and also in the third, whose theme is the analysis of civilization into these same psychological terms.

Interpretation of the Ten Commandments in similar terms occupies the fourth section. It includes such wide-ranging applications as a consideration of birth control (the author opposed it because of feelings of unhappiness claimed to result) in relation to the Ninth Commandment on coveting a neighbor's wife.

Relentlessly in the fifth section the author applies his nervous system yardstick to the Bible, God, Satan, sin, baptism, prayer, death, resurrection, the Son of God, and others such as miracles and parables. The last two sections contain the author's recommendations for the

future, individual and social, secular and religious, local and national, on the basis of his analyses in the previous sections.

This is definitely one of the most difficult and puzzling books I have ever read. It seems to be the product of a mind potentially brilliant but undisciplined and erratic.

Some of the points made are stimulating and thought-provoking. But well-established scientific conclusions are not only contradicted, but are ignored, as if the writer had never heard of them. For example, his italics emphasize this statement: "*. . . continued thought of the same subject to develop only a comparatively small spot in our brain cannot force the skull to grow, but causes pressure against it in the particular spot only*" (p. 436). Science finds definitely otherwise, that thought on even one subject uses large areas of the brain, that thought does not increase the brain mass with resultant pressure on the skull. But the author makes not the slightest mention of such facts.

Likewise historical evidence is blithely ignored when it gets in the way of the author's assumptions. Jesus' uniqueness is declared to be primarily the result of "his extraordinary training," in which "his parents" particularly conditioned his nervous system by constantly drilling into him their belief that he was the Messiah.

HERMAN KEITER

The Practice of Evangelism. By Bryan Green. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951. 258 pages. $3.00.

Words and ideas have histories as diverse as persons. Such is the case with a great word of the Christian faith, "evangelism." Originating as the confronting of men with the fact of the Christian faith, it was the important business of communicating truth through every avenue of human endeavor. In recent decades it became associated with emotionalism and subjectivism.

Now, dry-cleaned by a searching experience, this great but soiled word, so essential to those who bear the name of Evangelical, has come with new meaning. Canon Green, an Anglican rector, is one of those who has had startling success in exploring the field of techniques of evangelism, and the book is a clear recording of his experience. "Evangelism," says Canon Green, "is letting people know and persuading them to accept."

There is, then, no trick method, and those who have watched Canon Green at work will agree that he is no sensationalist. He preaches to enormous congregations in a simple, cogent, direct way and in a manner which "personalizes his audiences."

The chief benefit of this ploughing in the field of evangelism is that it tends to disturb us from a rather traditional landscape. Just when we had felt secure in an established heritage and, as Lutherans, feeling a bit self-conscious about innovations, there comes a new realization that the Gospel must always confront mankind. How to communicate this truth, how to show men the relevance of the Christian faith, how to crack the shell of the self-satisfied American who has confused idealism with Christianity—this is upon the conscience of every sincere Christian. It should be in the forefront of every Lutheran pastor's concern.

This book is worthy of careful reading, and will suggest ways in which a pastor may consider his calling as an evangelist.

RALPH W. LOEW

Here Is Help for You. By James Gordon Gilkey. New York: Macmillan, 1951. 164 pages. $2.50.

I think you can use this book, and this book can use you.

If you have wondered why liberals who can make no pretense to give religiously satisfying answers (by definition their

religion is always on the search without dogmatic truths) consistently draw the large audiences, this book will show you. They speak to people where they are with their problems, not where Bible-centered pastors think they ought to be. The book can help you to speak to people where they are. Despite its religious vacuum, this book rings with helpfulness on every page, using dozens of case histories and accurately reflecting the unspoken needs of this generation. This book can use you to make you a pastor sensitive to this age's queries.

You should be able to use the book too. There has long been a need for bibliotherapy which the pastor can offer which will reenforce his counseling insights after the effects of the interview begin to pale. You can put this book into use here because the wisdom is so obviously secular ("Common-sense") and the religion is so openly humanistic that your counselee can distinguish the two for himself without your worrying that he will take the religion for truth as well as the psychology. Dr. Gilkey comes out with a finite God, like Brightman. He believes that we can readily improve on Jesus' ideas of God. Any Sunday school pupil over twelve can see this is not the kind of religion you as a pastor are giving, and he will lay this chaff aside while he picks out the wheat for better daily handling of his problems. The book, at a secular level, is highly inspiring and filled with the kind of down-to-earth wisdom which Carnegie's *How to Stop Worrying* has. Neither makes any pretense to deal with the psychic depths of personality. At least your counselee will soon discover he hasn't met these deeper levels of motivation with the advice given in a book like this. But when Mrs. Neurasthenia visits you interminably, you can send her away with this book and she will think she got her money's-worth by consulting you.

GEORGE H. MUEDEKING

Kämpande Kyrka. By Anders Tauson-Hassler. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1951. 181 pages.

Tro och Tvivel. By Arvid Runestam. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1951. 118 pages.

The reviewer received both these books in the same package, and the titles certainly did not indicate that they had anything in common except that they came from Sweden. The one deals with a militant church and the other with faith and scepticism. However, I find that the two volumes can well be called to the attention of the reader in a single review.

Both authors are admirers of Frank Buchman and the Moral Re-Armament Movement. Particularly is this true with respect to Tauson-Hassler. This movement emphasizes divine guidance and the necessity of listening to the voice of God as he speaks to man. Bishop Runestam describes the nature of this speaking as that which comes into man's thoughts, conscience, visions, or imagination. It would seem to the reviewer, however, that the Christian cannot always be too certain as to the origin of the voice that speaks within.

The value of the books is not bound up with their authors' admiration for the Buchman movement. It lies in the call which they issue for a more vital and realistic Christian life. Bishop Runestam discusses in considerable detail the form in which a sense of guilt manifests itself in our generation. He describes it as a lack of meaning in life, emptiness, a lack of objectives, or a lack of interest in life or a sense of frustration. The bishop's description of the nature of faith and the difficulties in the path of faith are exceptionally well done.

Some time ago a poll was taken among the Swedish people to determine their attitudes to religion and the Church. Two things in particular were revealed through this poll. As we analyze the results we find that people felt that they were not

getting the answers from the Church which they felt they should have with respect to the problems of truth and with respect to the relevancy of the Christian faith to the problems of society. Tauson-Hassler's book is a call to the Church to make its message more relevant socially. He pleads that the Church might become the conscience of the nation.

These two books constitute one of the most hopeful signs in the life of the Swedish Church at the present time. If they were oriented toward the American scene they might be translated into the English.

A. D. MATTSON

En bok om flygplanet Ansgar. By Oscar Rundblom. Stockholm, 1950. 111 pages. Kr. 3:75.

This is an interesting and delightful account of how emergency transportation was secured for the missionaries of the Scandinavian missionary societies after the close of the war. The author was instrumental in securing the plane and arranging for the necessary permits. In 1945 the Norwegian Missionary Society appealed to the Swedish authorities for help in transporting its missionaries in Madagascar home. These missionaries were in a serious condition after their long sojourn in the tropics. In conferences with Count Bernadotte it was suggested that it might be possible to rent or borrow an American army plane for this purpose. Through various connections Dr. Rundblom was given an opportunity to present his case to the American authorities in Europe, and the final outcome was that he was permitted to buy an American plane from the surplus stock in Germany. The American flyers had named their plane "Haystack Annie," but the mission changed this to the more appropriate "Ansgar," in commemoration of the apostle to the North.

The plane was used by the missionary societies for five years and made trips to Madagascar, South Africa, India, and China. It was sold in 1950 to a commercial air line. The idea has since been adopted by other missionary agencies, and it is possible that in the future some co-operative ventures may be attempted.

E. H. WAHLSTROM

Preaching from Prophetic Books. Dr. Andrew W. Blackwood. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951. 206 pages. $2.50.

In his years of distinguished service at Princeton Seminary Dr. Blackwood did much to encourage the use of the Bible in preaching. No small part of this influence was exerted through the various publications that issued from his pen. Now as he extends his career in the Temple University School of Theology, he adds another volume to his significant contributions in this area.

The book is in harmony with the method and style with which the students and readers of the author have become familiar. It is suggestive rather than exhaustive. From his rich store of spiritual knowledge Dr. Blackwood has underscored the great distinctive truths of the prophets and made them live by pertinent illustration and vital application. He singles out seven of the Old Testament prophets and studies them with a view to exploring their homiletical resources. A good example of the expository method, this volume fixes upon the heart of the prophet's message, reduces it to a single compact statement, and develops its insights in orderly, integrated, and well applied themes.

There is interest—and, incidentally, homiletical suggestion—in the several titles: Amos, The Voice of God's Righteousness; Hosea, The Gospel From a Broken Heart; Jeremiah, The Experience of a Lonesome Saint; Habakkuk, The Conversion of an Honest Doubter. From such titles, summary and suggestive in themselves, the author leads into the pertinent and vital phases of each prophet's message.

The opening and closing chapters offer wise counsel to the preacher in the use of the prophets. Four additional sections present a comprehensive bibliography as well as helpful indexes.

If there is a shortcoming to be noted in this work it is that created by the very nature of the study. Manifestly the author can not, within the limits of one brief volume, explore the vast reaches of truth contained in such books as Isaiah, Jeremiah, or Ezekiel. He has succeeded in outlining the essential and distinct messages of these great geniuses. And his book is calculated to stimulate the student to pursue the matter further. But there are many areas of revelation left untouched so that the reader finds himself waiting for interpretations that do not appear. Possibly it is desirable for a work of this sort to leave us with our thirst unsatisfied.

The diligent student will find here, first of all, a method which should assist him in all his homiletical pursuits; then, insights which will give content to his preaching; and, finally, a practical outlook that contributes point and application and so fits preaching to the needs of men.

H. F. Baughman

The Struggle of the Soul. By Lewis Joseph Sherrill. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951. 155 pages. $2.50.

Now a member of the faculty of Union Theological Seminary, New York City, L. J. Sherrill has again produced a helpful and significant contribution to Christian Education. The author here attempts to trace "the religious development of the individual, through the ordinary crises of common life, from infancy to old age." The guiding thread of his study is a consideration of "the dynamic self as it encounters God at the various stages of human life and responds perhaps by outgoing faith; or perhaps by shrinking back in a self-protecting compromise; or even in full rejection; or perhaps by passing on without knowing it has met God at all."

Each period of an individual's growth is considered from the point of view of identifying the central problem of character development. Consequently central problems of character in childhood, youth, young maturity, middle life, and old age are discussed as individuation, weaning from parents, establishing basic identifications, achieving a mature view of life, and simplification. But Sherrill's discussions always rise beyond a mere concern with sociological and psychological factors; rather, his chief aim is to show that at every stage of life man is confronted in some manner by the living God. These confrontations occur in the common crises of ordinary life. In each encounter the human soul is challenged to growth and further maturity. At every stage an individual can go forward in faith or shrink back in unbelief.

A facile style of writing, a lucid and well articulated manner of presenting his material, and a thoroughly evangelical approach combine to make of this study a sound and sane contribution to a theological understanding of character development as it occurs through the encounter of the individual with God in the common crises of life.

Cleo V. Leitzel

Introduction to Comparative Mysticism. By Jacques De Marquette. New York: Philosophical Library, 1949. 229 pages. $3.75.

The author cautions the reader against confusing mysticism with spiritualism, occultism, and psychism. The mystic "seeks union with God alone and is not satisfied with anything short of his sublime goal" (20). "The ambition of these lectures is to make use of the method of comparative mysticism to try to draw the first faint outlines of the map of the subtle regions sensed by the mystics in their incursions beyond the veil of appearances" (19).

Admitting that the alleged knowledge value of mystical experiences is challenged because "'mystics are readily influenced by the images and ideas of their particular religion" (27), the author believes that "the method of a comparative study of mysticism enables us to begin to make a distinction between those aspects of religious experience which have been colored by traditional group-representations and those which their similarity in the mystics of different faiths authorize us to believe to be based more on real experience than on the dictum of ingrained and perhaps arbitrary preformations" (p. 28).

Lecture II presents "a short outline of the main tenets of Indian mystical philosophy" (32), indicating also what the author regards as "close similarities to Christian teachings" (52).

Lecture III is a "very summary outline of the general history of the vast array of the traditions of Buddhism" (78) and is followed in Lecture IV by an account of "the doctrines of the various Buddhist schools of mystical theology and their bearing on the quest of liberating enlightenment" (79). Of special interest is the author's claim that the Buddha did not deny or ignore the existence of God but believed "almost as in the Christian reliance on grace" (85) that we have the resort to the help of a transcendent divine reality.

In Lecture V (Greek and Hebrew Sources of Christian Mystical Theology) the author states that "Plotinus' accounts of his ecstasies are among the most sublime pages of mystical literature and have inspired countless thousands of noble souls, within as well as outside of Christianity" (122). "Anticipating by nearly two thousand years our modern anti-intellectual criticism, Plotinus insisted on the necessity of transcending the limitations of intellectual activity" (123).

In Lecture VI (The Mystical Apotheosis of Christianity) the author calls the roll in favor of mysticism by appealing especially to the Gospel of John, to Paul, Origen, Augustine, Dionysius the Areopagite, Santa Teresa, and John of the Cross. In reading this lecture one notes instances of inaccuracy in the documentation of New Testament quotations. Some of the author's interpretations of the New Testament may be questioned even by readers who defend a personalistic mysticism which is evangelical in character and which in the words of H. R. Mackintosh (*Types of Modern Theology,* 146) "is to be found at its profoundest in the pages of St. Paul and the Fourth Evangelist, and is indeed very much equivalent to the deepest and most intimate kind of personal religion."

Lecture VII (Islam's Trust in Unity) is an account of the mystical tradition of the Sufis.

Lecture VIII (Conclusion: The Message of Mysticism) reaffirms "the challenge of mysticism to all thoughtful people. It shows that definitely each one of us has in the secret chamber of his heart a mysterious window which can introduce him to a new and altogether different aspect of life, in a new realm of existence" (203). It is the author's hope that he has been enabled to "confirm, and perhaps render more vivid, the awareness of the immense realm of cosmic possibilities of which our daily world is but a puny aspect, and which adds more scope to our vision, more assurance to our faith, more expectations to our hope and more warmth to our love of the immediate and all embracing Divine Reality" (207).

Whether the essential mystical experience must be pantheistically interpreted as involving the dissolution, through divine absorption, of the human self or may properly be regarded in personalistic terms as God's possession of, but not displacement of, the human self is the subject of perpetual controversy. The reader of Jacques de Marquette's earnest presentation will be inspired or provoked into

deeper consideration of this perennial theme.

HJALMAR W. JOHNSON

God Makes the Difference. By Edwin McNeill Poteat. New York: Harper, 1951. 242 pages. $3.00.

Dr. Poteat, formerly president of Colgate Rochester Divinity School and now Baptist minister in Raleigh, N. C., has heretofore been best known for his interpretation of the parables and the passion of our Lord. His books are all marked by unique literary skill and creative imagination. This new book is his most ambitious one. Its purpose is "to establish the proposition that the invention of the idea of God . . . makes the important if not the definitive difference in the nature of all human experience and enterprise" (p. 50).

As the expression "invention of the idea of God" suggests, this is not a devotional or theological, and not even a specifically Christian, book. It is an essay in the philosophy of religion in general. Drawing upon science, philosophy, and world literature, as well as Christian sources, it roams over the whole wide range of human culture. It seeks to show the consequences for thought and action when nature, history, family, society, government, and market are viewed in the light of the theistic hypothesis. It defines from this point of view the meaning of love, law, suffering, death, immortality, and goodness.

The starting point is empirical and anthropocentric. Faith is the "resolve to give the highest possible meaning to all that we know" (p. 97). And God is the invention or hypothesis which expresses this meaning. The constitutive elements of the hypothesis are all-inclusiveness, cohesion, conscious purpose, love, and power. These are, then, the criteria which the author uses in determining the difference which God makes in the various areas of life. He is particularly concerned with showing that this approach to reality is more adequate than the naturalism which underlies contemporary science. No claim is made for the absoluteness or finality of the Christian revelation; the God of the "Judeo-Christian tradition" is simply the highest meaning which men have thus far been able to read into life.

Dr. Poteat's thinking conflicts at many points with evangelical faith. It is moralistic through and through. "The sin of every individual man is his own original sin and for it he is morally judged" (p. 64). Redemption is to be "released from sin for the task of laboring with God in the creation of the Beloved Community" (p. 121). The aim of the family is "the creation and perfection of the Sons of God in the Beloved Community" (p. 80). "Does it need to be said that in the moral aspects of the meaning we give to all that we know and in the discharge of the obligation they lay upon us lies the last good hope of the earth" (p. 17)? Had the author been familiar with Kierkegaard, to whom he makes but a passing and grossly misleading reference, he would have received valuable aid in progressing from the ethical to a more definitely Christian stage of thinking.

The speculative character of Dr. Poteat's thought is shown in his use of telepathy to prove immortality. He believes "that already communication has been established mechanically with discarnate persons" (p. 210) and asserts: "That it is possible, without the use of a physical medium, to transfer ideas may now be taken as definitely established" (p. 211). Committed to a dualistic metaphysics, according to which "spirit is pure quality" and "body is pure quantity," he cannot understand the scriptural way of thinking, to which such an antithesis is foreign. Hence he accuses Paul of contradicting himself in saying "There is a spiritual body." The scriptural doctrine of man as a psychophysical unit, of death as a genuine reality, and of the divine act of resurrection from the dead as the sole basis of post-mortem life seems more

compatible with true science than the speculation "that persons who have passed beyond the physical phase of life without having lost the radioactive essence of their being can communicate by means of high-frequency radiation with living persons who are sufficiently sensitive to receive them" (p. 217).

This is the work of a poetic rather than a philosophical mind. The author's facility with language and literary allusions at times leads him to unforgivably loose thinking. For example, "Nature never did betray the heart that loved her, or the hand that dissected her. Neither did God." Does man's hand dissect God?

From the point of view of evangelical Christianity, the task of relating faith to contemporary scientific, philosophical, and cultural problems has been done with the same literary brilliance but with greater competence by Karl Heim.

T. A. KANTONEN

20 Confirmation Sermons. By Pastors of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1951. 226 pages. $3.00.

The title exactly describes this book. These sermons are not literary gems but warm-hearted, personal messages to young folks the pastor has been preparing for confirmation. Almost without exception they are rooted in the text, and most of them are clearly outlined. Titles and texts are memorable. Illustrations are introduced effectively. A majority of the sermons begin with attention-claiming paragraphs, often a well-worded illustration. Homiletical devices show a similarity that could come from former teachers who taught similar methods. Vocabulary is generally suited to the age-group, in some sermons it indicates that pastors had not been afraid to use theological terms in their classes. An appendix carries 22 pages of suggested texts for confirmation sermons.

AMOS JOHN TRAVER

One Thousand Radio Voices for Christ. By Walter A. Maier. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950. 454 pages. $3.00.

Go Quickly and Tell. By Walter A. Maier. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950. 444 pages. $3.00.

These two volumes contain the radio messages preached on the fifteenth Lutheran Hour by the late Dr. Maier. In addition to the addresses, both volumes contain extensive reports on the effects of the radio broadcasts in producing conversions, restoring lapsed Christians, comforting the perplexed, etc. Stations in forty-eight countries broadcast these programs.

The Ten Commandments Will Not Budge. By B. A. Maurer. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1951. 104 pages. $1.75.

The title of these thoughts is born of an American poet, James Russell Lowell. The temper of these conversational pieces is American religious realism. Each commandment is dealt with in a single essay. Other pertinent, correlated ideas of Law, God, Sin, Property are included in the chapters.

These meditative excursions into the meanings of the Commandments are pointed, theological, homey in their content. Each chapter moves from the biblical and theological idea into the area of the everyday life of the Christian. The author seeks simply to have the reader "see the wondrous things in God's Law." He succeeds in extending a Christian's vision.

This booklet will be used most profitably if placed in the hands of prospective members of adult catechetical classes.

G. MARTIN RUOSS

So You Want to Speak. By Mark W. Lee. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1951. 109 pages. $1.50.

It is hard to believe that such a tiny book with such an undignified title was

intended primarily for the clergy. But Mark Lee, chairman of the Department of Speech, Northwestern Schools, Minneapolis, has some worthwhile pointers for preachers, and for laymen whose religious work involves public speaking. Most significant is his insistence on the principle that it is always the speaker's responsibility to gain and to hold the interest of his listeners. For the pastor who is inclined to blame Satan, rather than himself, for his congregation's restlessness and inattentiveness, Mark Lee offers valuable help.

The author's obviously fundamentalist background, coupled with his admiration for Billy Graham, rob his book of some of the appeal it might otherwise have had for Lutherans. But his approach is fresh and direct, and most of his arrangements are sound.

HENRY B. LUFFBERRY

Ersta En Bildrapsodi. By Sven-Åke Rosenberg. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1951. 282 pages. Kr. 22.

This book contains pictures of Ersta, the oldest deaconess home in Stockholm which, in 1951, celebrated its hundredth anniversary. The book with a brief history of how the work began and the many pictures illustrative of present-day activity will interest those who seek to know the Swedish Church better or those who promote the work of the female diaconate in the United States or Canada.

BENJAMIN LOTZ

Vår Tro och Vårt Vetande. By Gert Borgenstierna. Stockholm: Sveriges Kristliga Studentrörelses Bokförlag, 1949. 187 pages. Kr. 5:75.

The twenty-eight page introduction to this spirited discussion of faith and knowledge is a critique of the views of Professor Hedenius. "Faith," writes Börgenstierna, "knows that what it knows, it knows not through the deliberations of reason but through God's revelation and it is altogether certain that what it knows is truth" (9-10). "Why do I believe in God? Because God Himself has created this vital relationship between Himself and me" (26). If there is to be any worth-while discussion of faith and knowledge one must give respectful consideration to the witness of faith and not "in every instance immediately liquidate the claim which it affirms about itself. Personally I am certain that such justice in judging can be accomplished only by one who is himself a believer" (10; cf. 144).

Christian faith must begin with Jesus who is the revelation of God (19). The confession that Jesus Christ is Lord is not the conclusion of an intellectual construction but on the contrary comes first in our faith (137). If we would see Jesus we must go to the Bible without imposing upon it the demand for an allegedly more historical or authentic Jesus supposedly to be discovered behind or beyond the biblical witness to Him. If we do not see Jesus through the biblical witness, He remains for us the Unknown (34-35; cf. 46, 49). When one has found God Himself in the man Jesus, then one has truly found Jesus and the recognition of God in Jesus is an act of faith (40; cf. 60-61). When man has failed in all of his own efforts to discover God and has despaired of his own human resources in the search for God, he is ready to hear God speak authoritatively and redemptively in the Incarnate Word (62-69; cf. 89-91). The words of Jesus are God's creative acts (72; cf. 105). Test yourself in the light of God's Word instead of attempting to judge the Word according to your "light" (77). In the mood of Kierkegaard, the author affirms that "here with us in the world of sin we will in every instance never be free from tension. It is the sinner, not some one else, who is to experience the indescribable assurance of knowing that he in his solitariness is sought by God. It is the same sinner who is to experience the consuming concern about his salvation. We

have the eternal life fully and wholly and without any merit or effort on our part. But at the same time we do not have it or we have it only according to the promise, and it costs us intensive work, sacrifice, and judgment to hold fast to the promise" (81). The author also affirms however that in the life of one who trusts Jesus there is no longer "room for anguish and hopelessness" (129; cf. 148). That Jesus Christ is Lord is "an assurance in which man can rest" (138), an assurance in which man is "sustained and lifted" by a Power not his own. With a complete trust man has placed his life-destiny in the hands of Jesus" (138). "The death-marked man has found in Jesus the *Lord of glory,* the joyless man the *Lord of joy* and the restless man the *Lord of peace"* (158). "In Jesus is concentrated all the joy, peace and glory which this world cannot give" (149). "His word and His grace have the same weight and the same actuality in every phase of life" (156). In our stead He made the Sacrifice we could not make (105) and He has not ceased to work. "What Jesus did *for* us receives personal import only if we allow Him to accomplish His work *in us"* (123, cf. 125). The individual in whom the Lord is accomplishing His work cannot remain in narrow self-centeredness. For whether recognized or not, Jesus is Lord over the whole social order (168) as the Source and inspiration of joyful and sacrificial love manifested in constructive service. Where there is not such motivation and such a spirit in social work, "the forms of organization soon become the end and man becomes only the means" (171).

The concluding chapter is an exposition on the corporate life of believers in the Church of Jesus Christ. The true Church is "the real unity between Him and those whom He has won through His Word, His reconciliation and His resurrection. This mystical unity is the innermost being of the Church" (177). It is the exalted Jesus who continues the work of gathering His people together. "He Himself and those whom He has gathered together constitute this mystical unity which is the Church" (178). "Where the Word and the Sacraments are in use, there is the Church because there is Jesus and there are those whom He has called to Himself" (184).

The author writes in a clear, positive, and concise manner. Because of the controversial context indicated in the Introductory Chapter, one feels that the author at times exposes himself to the charge of being excessively anti-intellectualistic. Borgenstierna, however, does not say that we may adopt an optional attitude toward loving the Lord with all our mind. The aim is rather that every thought shall be brought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. This helpful volume deserves a warm welcome and a wide reading.

HJALMAR W. JOHNSON

Från Hustavlans Tid. By Hilding Pleijel. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrhans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1951. 207 pages. Kr. 9:50.

"When on an August day in 1914 the church bells pealed the call for mobilization they rang in a new and as yet unknown world and tolled for a bygone epoch which can never again return." Thus the author closes the major essay in this collection of studies in that receding epoch. *Hustavlan* refers to the "Table of Duties" which appeared for centuries in Luther's Small Catechism and spelled out the duties of each class in society. It was a society dominated by the Church in Sweden and carefully organized on a model which probably came as close to being a Lutheran community as will ever be found. It was the Sweden of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries whose Church Law of 1686 marked the high water mark of the influence of the church on the state. Orthodoxy reigned in theology, and a strict church discipline enforced by the state characterized every phase of life. Probably the modern re-

spect for law, which visitors note in Sweden, would be unthinkable without this era. In any case it was a period when churchly pietism prevailed—a community form of reverence which began to disintegrate when the movement known as Pietism substituted a form of individual religious experience that broke up the older community.

Prof. Pleijel occupies the chair of Church History at Lund University and is head of a unique church history archives which seeks its material not so much in literary records as in the social materials, yet available in the churches and villages, which throw light on old folk ways and traditions. The body of this book concerns the popular notions of two centuries about the "three estates" whose duties are defined in the Table of Duties of the *Hustavla.* These estates were the political (government), the ecclesiastical (the clergy), and the domestic or economic (the family—then the center of industry or agriculture). All three were parts of one society, which was supposedly Christian. The study is not only fascinating because of the wealth of concrete examples given, especially from the author's own home congregation, but it is sobering because it suggests that even the twentieth century church still thinks in terms of a by-gone social order and is unprepared for the revolutionary changes swirling around it today.

How much history can lie back of the white handkerchief which the clergy of the period usually carried as a part of the liturgical garb appears from one of the essays, while another finds a reflection of the period in a letter issued by the bishop of Vexico to his diocese within a decade of the Upsala Meeting of 1593. One article places the Sunday school of today's Sweden in a much longer historical perspective than the movement bearing this name. And the book as a whole has much to say of the place of religious education in the parishes of Sweden.

The reader will receive from this short treatise a real insight into a religious culture of Old Sweden which left its mark not only on modern Sweden but on the thousands of immigrants who came to America from that land just as the old order was breaking up. It would not be hard to duplicate some of this material from the early records of the Swedes on the Delaware and of the later immigrant congregations on the Mississippi.

CONRAD BERGENDOFF

Biography of Drs. Sigmund and Gottfried Fritschel. By Herman L. Fritschel. Author, 6928 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee 13, Wis., 1951. 136 pages. $3.00.

The author is one of the sons of Gottfried Fritschel. The publication of this work is therefore in part an act of filial devotion to a great father and an equally great uncle. The author draws upon his personal knowledge to present an intimate, moving picture of the life and work of these two great brothers who were the giants of the early Iowa Synod and who so strangely complemented each other in their aptitudes and abilities that they made a team of unusual effectiveness.

The book is divided into a large number of brief chapters, which try to sketch the characteristics and activities of the two brothers in thumb-nail fashion. This makes for rapid and easy finding of just that information which is desired at the moment. The presentation of Gottfried's life is especially gripping, and rises to quite a climax. Much light is shed on the nature of the early Iowa Synod; on her controversies; and especially on the predestination controversy with Missouri. A good deal of this is by way of intimate information which is not readily accessible elsewhere in English.

The text would have gained much by careful editorial work and accurate proof-reading. A number of little mistakes ought to be corrected in a future edition. In spite of these mistakes in detail, how-

ever, the volume is a fine contribution to the early history of the Iowa Synod and helps to fill the long-felt need for English information about the two Fritschel brothers.

ALBERT A. JAGNOW

A Protestant Dictionary. By Vergilius Ferm. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. 283 pages, $5.00.

After editing a larger one-volume *Encyclopedia of Religion* (1945), Professor Ferm has undertaken to prepare a smaller desk book for which he has written all the articles himself. As the title suggests, the emphasis is on Protestantism. The position of the author, in so far as it is revealed in his selection and treatment of subjects, may be described as liberal. Lutheranism is accorded generous treatment —sometimes too exclusively, as when it is assumed that the term New Measures (s.v.) was distinctively Lutheran.

The author's style is chatty. His writing is careless and suggests that the book was hastily thrown together. The Church of Revelation is described as having "no salaried religious services." The Erlangen School" developed theological speculation with emphasis upon Biblical exegesis, the confessional statements on theological matters of the church in need of reconsideration in the light of better biblical knowledge"—whatever this means. The article on Fundamentalism concludes with the strange statement that "the cause of liberal and progressive views has slowly and quietly prevailed in most sections except where provincial ecclesiastical powers have maintained their control," and it is quite impossible to tell what Modernism is from the article on this subject. Casual opinions and prejudices are intermingled with verifiable facts. Some articles are not helpful, many are unreliable. A case in point is the article on Offertory, which is treated much more satisfactorily in almost any dictionary of the English language.

THEODORE G. TAPPERT

Medieval Skepticism and Chaucer. By Mary Edith Thomas. New York: William-Frederick Press, 313 West 35th Street, 1950. 184 pages, $3.00.

In order to determine whether and to what extent Chaucer reflected the skepticism of his age, Dr. Thomas investigated the traces of perplexity, criticism, doubt, and disbelief in the non-theological literature of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The fairly considerable evidence which she found in the preparation of a doctor's thesis is here presented with liberal quotations from contemporary sources. The book is a useful addition to the history of popular religion as well as of literature.

When We Pray. By Daniel Nystrom. Rock Island: Augustana Book Concern, 1950. 261 pages. $2.50.

Good judgment was exercised in selecting these prayers from a wide variety of sources. Forty sources are mentioned in the "acknowledgments." Among these are some of the finest collections of prayers, new and old.

The first section contains seven morning and nine evening prayers, prayers for children, and table prayers. Then follows a prayer-book for daily home worship.

The second division contains devotions for special days: seventeen Church Year festivals and twelve possible family events.

Section three contains 129 prayers for family use. They cover a great variety of occasions and petitions. The authorship of each prayer is stated with the prayer. This may not always prove helpful.

Part four presents a choice collection of 92 prayers for private use.

There are four lectionaries in the book. (1) Bible readings for daily home worship, for morning and evening. (2) Daily Bible readings when worship takes place once each day. (3) Daily Bible readings for three years, based on the Church Year. (4) Bible readings for festivals of the Church Year. There is an index of authors, and one of prayer topics.

HARVEY D. HOOVER

CONTRIBUTORS

E. E. RYDEN, Rock Island, Illinois, is editor of *The Lutheran Companion,* the official organ of the Augustana Lutheran Church.

ANDERS NYGREN, bishop of Lund, Sweden, is president of the Lutheran World Federation.

GEORGE W. FORELL, professor at Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minnesota, is on leave-of-absence for work with the National Lutheran Council.

GERHARD OTTERSBERG is professor of history at Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa.

HARRY F. BAUGHMAN is president of Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

SIM SOUTHARD is a graduate student of the Southern Baptist Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky.

GEORGE DRACH is a pastor of the United Lutheran Church.

Among the reviewers of books in this number are RAYMOND T. STAMM, professor of the New Testament in Gettysburg Seminary; GEORGE E. MENDENHALL, assistant professor of Biblical Theology in Hamma Divinity School; ULRICH S. LEUPOLD, professor of the New Testament in Waterloo Seminary; PAUL H. ROTH, professor of Church History in Northwestern Seminary; WILLARD D. ALLBECK, professor of Church History in Hamma Divinity School; E. THEODORE BACHMANN, lecturer in Church History in Luther Seminary, St. Paul; T. A. KANTONEN, professor of Systematic Theology in Hamma Divinity School; MARTIN J. HEINECKEN, professor of Systematic Theology in the Philadelphia Seminary; EMIL W. METZNER, professor of Systematic Theology in Wartburg Seminary, Dubuque; RALPH W. LOEW, pastor of Trinity Church, Buffalo, N. Y.; GEORGE H. MUEDEKING, pastor of Christ Church, El Cerrito, Calif.; ALVIN D. MATTSON, professor of Ethics in Augustana Seminary, Rock Island; HARRY F. BAUGHMAN, president of the Gettysburg Seminary; HJALMAR W. JOHNSON, professor of the Philosophy of Religion in Augustana Seminary, Rock Island.